

# THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. IV

APRIL, 1904

NO. 10

## The Social Opportunity.

**C**RISIS is but another name for opportunity. Every crisis is a weighing in the balance of the race, the nation, or individual. It is the time when we pass on into something greater than we were, or else fall back into something less. A crisis never leaves us where it finds us. It is always a judgment day, binding us to lower or to higher life.

Today, in the industrial crisis for which we wait, a judgment of the world draws near. And it is the most significant and fatal judgment before which the human race has stood. It will define and determine the human future as no other crisis has ever done. In truth, we may say that this is the first time that the world as a whole has come to judgment. There have been crises of empires, states, religious and civilizations. Not once nor twice only have prophets come proclaiming the end of the world; and not once nor twice only has the world come to an end. The break-up of the Roman Empire, with the obscuring and disintegration of Greek culture and the volcanic breaking forth of a fresh and primal world in the form of the barbarian hordes, is the nearest approach to an analogy for what awaits us. The rejection of the unfit Roman world, and the creation of a new world out of the Slavic and Teutonic deluge, was certainly a judgment of the human race. Still, we have had nothing so universal or determinative as the industrial crisis will prove to be; nothing so weighted with the weal or woe of the whole human family; nothing so decisive or creative of the channel in which human history shall run for a long time to come. It is the first time that mankind has been summoned to anything like a choice concerning its own destiny. It is the first time that the human factor, the factor of the social will, the factor of conscious selection or intelligent election, has entered into the determining of the world's life and

arrangements. It is the first time that man has had the opportunity for even rudely attempting to make his own world. It is the first time that the human will has, or may, become a directive force in evolution—supplanting evolution with life that has become conscious of itself.

All this is because the world is more directly organized by its mode of production and distribution than ever before. The present world-organization is not political or military, as was the case with the Roman world, but economic and financial. Kings and parliaments, presidents and congresses, courts and legislatures, are now but mere puppets in the hands of the owners or controllers of the sources of profit. Never before has the world been so universally organized by a single economic mode or system. Even the peoples of Asia and Africa, who have not yet gone through the factory stage of civilization, are yet so involved in it that they will be changed with the rest of the world by the collapse of the industrial system.

It requires no peculiar gift of prophecy to foretell the doom of capitalism. Its inevitable collapse is a commonplace topic of conversation. The present mode of production and distribution, the organization of the world for the making of profit, the capitalist way of getting the world's work done, is incompetent to very much longer administer the world's processes. The sources of profit are being rapidly centralized, congested and exploited to exhaustion. The financial world of today is but the drama of the *Titanic* struggle between the great capitalist forces for the control of the diminishing sources of profit. When the time comes that there are no longer any profits for capitalists to feed upon, as soon come it will, and when thus the labor-power of the world is workless and breadless because capital can no longer profitably employ it, then the collapse and chaos of capitalism will be at hand. Then the end of the present world will have come. The capitalist class is terribly conscious of this, and only hopes to put off the deluge for another generation. It is no longer a question of the inevitability of this universal judgment day; it is merely a question of when it will come, or how long it can be put off, or how to prepare for it.

What kind of a new world will emerge from the ruins and red dust of the old? What sort of a human future, what world-prospect or social horizon, can be predicted for the human family when it awakes from the night and nightmare of the capitalist system.

The Socialist is the only man who can determine the answer to this world-question. What the human world will be, after the capitalist collapse, will depend upon the quality as well as the quantity of the Socialist movement before the collapse shall arrive. The Socialist has in his hands the only pattern by which we can at last have a society in which wealth and opportunity,

love and beauty, truth and freedom, may be common to all men. He has in his hands the collective power by which man may consciously and deliberately make his own world. And because he has the pattern and the power, his, therefore, is the responsibility. The capitalist crisis is the world-opportunity of the Socialist movement. As I have said, crisis spells opportunity. And opportunity means responsibility for achieving the highest that the opportunity affords. It is, therefore, the Socialist movement that must stand in the capitalist day of judgment. It is the Socialist movement alone which can decide whether the world shall go back into the melting pot, to be formed anew only after a long period of universal darkness and suffering, or whether the fall of the capitalist industrial system shall but disclose the outlines of a co-operative and happier world.

There has never been such a stupendous and significant moment in human history as that which the world is now approaching. There has never been such responsibility in human hands as that which the Socialist holds in his. The destiny of the world for generations to come trembles on the word and the ballot, the character and the fidelity, of the obscurest proletaire.

I for one am not at all of those who hold that Socialism is inevitable merely because the collapse of capitalism is inevitable. Because an old world breaks up, it does not at all follow that a better world shall immediately take its place. The progress of the world has been by no means a steady ascent. The human race has had periods of collapse, of darkness and lost cultures, of extinguished civilizations. There are things in the past that the present might vainly strive to understand or achieve. Human progress has been spiral rather than a continuous ascent. It is possible that we might have a period of despotism and darkness, with the obscuring of all that is hopeful and good, following upon the chaos and disorder of the capitalist crisis. There are many signs of this possibility. Among these are the subsidization of all the sources of intelligence, such as the newspapers, the schools, the universities, the churches and political platforms. The servility and utter prostitution of the human intellect; the jaunty puerility and brainlessness of university instruction; the sheer brutality and silliness of pulpit preaching, and its competition with "yellow" journalism in vulgarity and sensationalism; the journalism of the world organized as a system of universal misinformation—all of this betokens ill preparation for the nearing judgment day. Then a body politic like ours, that has become so accustomed to corruption in its administrative and legislative offices that this corruption is accepted as a matter of course; a body politic that is so accustomed to public shame that it has lost the sense of shame; a body politic from which government by corruption and for private interests need no longer conceal itself—this too betokens ill to the human future. And the back-

door incoming of a vassal middle-class, formed anew from the independent middle-class that was driven from the industrial front door by the capitalist lords—this increases our common submission and prostration before enthroned private wealth. And then, saddest and most foreboding of all, is the misleading of labor by its most authorized leaders; the corruption of the more highly organized trades by capitalist financial and political influences. The fact that probably Mr. Hanna had, and Mr. Hearst has, more influence with the organized labor of today than Eugene V. Debs—this certainly should cause us to pause in our assumption that Socialism is inevitable because of the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism.

Socialism will come upon the ruins of capitalism only if the Socialist has come. The co-operative world will arrive when the co-operative hands of the working class shall bring it in. We shall have economic freedom only when we are worthy and brave enough to take it. We shall have the good and the free world, fit for a risen humanity to live in, only if the Socialist movement shall be prepared to go into the capitalist crisis as the better world's creator. We shall have, after capitalism, just the kind of a world that we are pure and strong enough to make. It is therefore time that the Socialist movement look to itself, to its own coherency and quality, and see what manner of movement it be; see whether it may stand in the nearing judgment day, and prove mighty to make the new world wherein dwelleth opportunity and abundance of life for every man.

## II.

It is high time that the Socialist movement shall pass beyond the factional or personal stage of its growth. Let us admit that parties within parties, factions and mere personal followings, are incidental and inevitable to the beginnings and development of any great movement. But with this admission, let us discern and affirm that their continuation will prevent any movement from becoming great or worthy to command human destiny. The moment any man understands the significance and responsibility of the Socialist movement, that moment he ceases to be a member of a faction or a mere disputant. Self-seeking and personal ambition have no place in true service or greatness. They belong only to narrowness and ignorance, to the jungle and the menagerie, or to the barn-yard cackle. They are limitations of mind due to our animal inheritance. No man is free to serve until he has passed beyond them. No man understands the real outcome and blossom of Socialism until he has emerged from the degradation and pettiness of personal self-seeking. When the human world comes, Napoleon will be no more than the forgotten wolf that howled in the night. For, as man's humanity de-

velops, as he becomes truly individualized, his interests and outlooks become so universal in their character that he cannot endure a joy that is not a contribution to the common good of the whole.

Now to the measure that we become true to the Socialist hope for the world, to that measure we pass beyond personal and factional disputes and interests; to that measure we become worthy of its mission, of its high calling to emancipate mankind. The closer we examine the causes of most of our factional troubles, the more we will find them to be personal self-seekings, masquerading as principle. Men unconsciously seize upon some fragment of a truth or principle, and make it a platform upon which to exalt themselves. Personal ambition is essential treason anyhow, and the self-seeker will always unconsciously or consciously lead or direct a movement or faction in the interests of his self-seeking. And it is time we understood this self-seeking origin and nature of nearly all of our factional troubles, and that we outgrow them by relating ourselves to the larger outlook and opportunity of the Socialist movement. It is time that we put away these childish things, in order to seize upon greater things that are unused in our hands.

It is not leadership, but fellowship that the world needs; not the leader, or the hero, or the prophet; but the companion, the friend, the comrade. The really dangerous man of any generation is the one who renders himself indispensable to it. He who renders himself indispensable to a movement is the one who exhausts rather than strengthens it. There is no treason so certain, however unconscious it be, as that of seeking to make a great movement dependent upon one's self.

Unless the championship of a cause makes for nobility and beauty of life, unless it lifts us above the vulgarity and wastefulness of self-seeking, unless it carries us beyond the sordid and wretched personal ambitions that have been the bane of every historic movement, we shall make ourselves and the Socialist movement unworthy of the Socialist ideal and opportunity.

Our factions are a part of our capitalist inheritance. They are survivals of the animal mind of capitalism. They are the persistence of the competitive spirit that has produced the capitalist monster.

For capitalism is but the survival of the animal in man; the survival of the predatory world of the jungle. Our present industrial world is due to the fact that we have not yet become human; that we are still beasts of prey, fighting with each other for our bread. Those of us who possess are but the lion, or the tiger, or the wolf, with paw upon our prey. We are still cannibals, by economic indirection; still peeping

from the forest of our primal experience; still waiting to be evolved into the human. When the world of man is really created out of its present raw and unorganized material, when we really blossom into the human from the animal, then we shall not have a world like ours—a world with resources for the abundant and ennobling support of countless billions of human beings, and yet the theater of an economic strife that blights and starves the most of a population that is but a mere handful compared to what it might be. This destructive capitalist mind or system is but the persistence of the wild beast mind and temper. And to the measure that the socialist is led by self-seeking or factional interest, to that measure he perpetuates the capitalist or animal state of mind that he has come to destroy; to that measure he hinders the day of the yet unborn humanity, whose mind shall be love or fellowship.

Besides, we may make sure that we can render no better service to the possessing class than to be at odds among ourselves as Socialists. We must expect that, as the movement develops, the emissaries of capitalism will be busy amongst us, wearing the disguise of ardent socialists, in order to create strife and helplessness in the Socialist movement. Capitalism will have no better servants than the strife-makers in the Socialist organization.

And when inevitable differences of opinion as to methods or tactics arise, we can discuss these matters, and arrive at coordinations and conclusions without becoming personal; without seeking to impugn the faithfulness of character of those who differ with us. In these matters, the Socialist should be a gentleman, and set a higher standard of political controversy than the capitalist parties of the existing order present. For instance, some of us very decidedly differed with Mr. Debs, three years ago, on questions of party organization and tactics. Yet who of us ever thought of questioning Mr. Debs' magnificent and unequalled service in the cause of labor, or his unimpeachable fidelity to that cause? I do not think that, in any of that well-forgotten controversy, I ever heard his most bitter opponent question Mr. Debs the man. Here was a question that was not fundamentally personal, but one that had to do with the basis and development of the American Socialist movement. We got through with that controversy badly sometimes, but happily at last, and learned some lessons in the ethics of discussion that we shall not have to learn over again.

Then, too, factions among ourselves prevent us from seizing upon the opportunities that are presented to us by the daily political and industrial event; prevent us from rightly exploiting the current social, and political, and financial phe-

nomena as interpretations and justifications of our Socialist philosophy.

There is a sense in which a movement, as well as an individual, must learn how to find life through losing it; and it is only as the Socialist movement shall turn from personal conflicts within itself to the larger opportunities presented by the economic and political development of society, that we shall really get rid of our factions. We are released from sordid and petty interests by relating ourselves to interests that are great and universal. Just as the individual becomes as great as the thing to which he relates himself, so the Socialist movement will become as great as the life-interests, as wide as the human prospect, that it takes in and stands for.

### III.

There is no one so well prepared as the Socialist to interpret current events. The daily history of the nation and the world ought to be the Socialist's university. Every event, from the Philippine war to the Chicago theater fire, from the revision of our public school system to the latest historical novel, ought to be seized upon as a platform upon which the Socialist should stand and speak his interpretative message. He should show what each event or development means in the light of the economic law of history, and in the light of the Socialist hope for a world of fellowship.

For instance, there has been much ignorant and fruitless discussion on so-called "imperialism" this last five or six years, in both England and America. The Socialist has been the only one who could interpret these present day wars of conquest, these mere picnics of loot and murder, as modes or phases of economic competition. They are but the necessity of the growth of capitalism. When the people of a nation become too poor to buy the things which they make with their own hands, the owners of the sources of profit must seek new markets and cheaper labor. That is why England is in Africa and Asia; why the United States is in the Philippine Islands, and why we are reaching out grasping hands to the islands and peoples of South America. We are expanding in order that our capital may have the contract labor, or the disguised slave system, that we now have in the Sandwich Islands, that we may unload upon exploited peoples our surplus products. And, of course, every child employed in the cotton mills of Egypt or India tends to lower the wage and intensify the struggle of every girl in the New England cotton mill and of every child in the cotton mills of the south. And every slave that works in the contract system of "our colonies" makes the struggle of labor in the United States so much the harder, and the lowering of the wage to the Asiatic level a certain tendency. As Socialists we could have shown the whole genius and capitalist nature of the passion of the nations for

expansion; could have made clear that imperialism, or benevolent assimilation, is but a mere commercial and speculative development. But it does not seem to me that we have availed ourselves, as Socialists, of the opportunity presented to us by the imperialistic development. We could have made much more pedagogic use of it than we have. Our tendency has been to ignore it as a matter that concerned only the capitalist parties. So far as the immediate issue of it was concerned, that was true; but it is not true that we should have ignored the discussion; for it was our rightful platform, one of our supreme opportunities for showing the economic nature of the question, and of showing how its political aspects were a mere deceit and a humbug.

We should also have availed ourselves of the opportunity for showing the universal solidarity of labor-conditions; of showing how, in the capitalist organization of the world, the whole labor body of the world must inevitably be dragged down to labor's lowest condition; of showing how universal is the labor problem, and how universal and world-redemptive must be its solution.

Again, there was a phase of the discussion of the coal strike, which we failed to interpret, and by which many of the Socialist speakers and journals were led into false positions and concessions. The Hearst newspapers and the clergy took up the cry of "public rights" as being superior to the rights of either party in the struggle. This proposition was announced with great pomp and solemnity by politicians and doctors of divinity, who imagined themselves to be putting on a bold moral front. Many Socialist speakers and journals fell into something very near the same proposition. The whole discussion was made to pivot upon the rights of the public, or of society, as superior to the rights of the contending classes of society. It was held that the right of "the public" to coal was greater than the right of the capitalist to his profits, or the right of the miner to better hours and conditions of labor. But the whole proposition was a fundamental lie, based upon an obsolete and fallacious philosophy. As a matter of fact, "the public" had absolutely no rights at all in the matter, because "the public" had failed to do right. The so-called rights of "the public" do not, and cannot, extend beyond the measure to which "the public" does right to the humblest member of society. A society that consents that those who dig its fuel and climate from the earth shall labor under conditions of danger and exhaustion; a society that consents that those of its members upon whom it depends for light and heat shall be beaten into submission, to long labor-hours and low wages; a society that does not accept the responsibility for seeing that every one of its members shall

have the full equivalent of the whole product of his labors—such a society, such a public, deserves to freeze and starve, and to suffer all the consequences of its own ignorance, cowardice and irresponsibility. Such a public has no rights which any righteous man is bound to respect. A society or a public has a right to demand from each of its members only that measure of justice and service which it gives. If a public evades responsibility for economic and social justice for each of its members, then the members of such a society are absolved from responsibility for its comfort. The right of the miners to win their struggle was infinitely superior to any so-called public rights, and it was only the fundamental immorality in which our society is grounded that tolerated any other proposition. Public rights cannot outrun social righteousness. Individual responsibility for society can go no further than society's responsibility for the whole well-being of the individual. The process of reasoning that pivots itself upon the so-called theory of public rights is utterly misleading and treasonable. If we have a public mind or conscience that will not awaken to its responsibility for making wealth and opportunity common to each of its members, then such a society ought to be frozen and starved into enlightenment and responsibility. It is time we had a thorough clearing up of this matter of so-called public rights as against the rights of the organized worker in the struggle for the betterment of his condition. If Mr. Mitchell had but had the discernment and moral nerve to have held out a little longer, if Mr. Mitchell had not allowed Mr. Morgan and his associates to enable Mr. Roosevelt and other quacks to make political capital for themselves out of the suffering of the miners, the so-called public might have been taught some such lesson as this before the strike was settled. Sooner or later, this "dear public" will have to learn its lesson—the lesson that it has no rights beyond the righteousness and fullness of life which it extends to its every member. And the Socialist is the man to teach it.

#### IV.

Another matter of great pertinence and importance is the gradual readjustment of our public school system in accordance with the capitalist mind and psychology. We have conventionally looked upon our public school as the kindergarten and safeguard of our liberties. America inherited the best results of the philosophy that worked for the French Revolution. It was only in America that the ideals of Rousseau and the Revolution were partially realized. It was here that the right to a free look at life was asserted by Paine, Jefferson and Franklin: here, that a secular public life was made possible;

here, that the development of a free public school tended to the preservation and increase of the idea of a free life. If the propertied classes had foreseen the results of the public schools, if the now developed capitalist brain could go behind the gifts of the revolutionists and philosophers of France to America, there would be no separation of church and state, and there would be no free public school. More than one capitalist writer or lawyer has, within the past three or four years, denounced the public school system as a menace to the existing propertied order of things. And rapidly is our public school instruction being subtly perverted into interests of the possessing class. On the economic side, this achievement is simple enough, for the whole public school system of the United States has practically become the private property of a single school-book trust, which employs gangs of ruffians to go up and down the land to brow-beat and intimidate public school teachers; to blacklist and throw out of employment any who stand against the trust; to corrupt legislatures, and town, county and city school boards. This school-book trust is not only organizing the American public school system for its private profit, but decides what kind of history, what kind of elementary economics or social science, what kind of literary classics, shall be taught. It is interesting and easy to trace the trade-marks of capitalism all through our present public school instruction; to point out the subtle yet sure perversions of fact and of history; to record omissions of things once taught in the schools, and the addition of things not previously taught. We may also note the introduction of the military spirit and ideal into the public school; the instruction in and insistence upon the child's reverence for patriotism—patriotism, the superstition which our masters impose upon us, in order to keep the workers of the world divided against each other; patriotism, which has come to be little more than crime with the flag over it.

But most insidious of all is the changed motive of public school education that has come by the direction of capitalism. Under the guise of technical or industrial education, we are having the gradual elimination of those smatterings of literature and history which make for crude and yet potential idealisms, and for inspirations of the child, and the substitution therefor of an instruction and training which shall fit the child to be an improved wage-slave. Coming as an educational reform, the so-called industrial training will have as its result the converting of the child into an improved capitalist machine. The boy, and even the girl, will issue from the school with the psychology, as well as the training, that will fit

him or her to become an improved and even enthusiastic producer of profit for the profit-makers. The end will be to destroy what imagination capitalism has left to the youth, and to combat organized labor with a prepared and trained unorganized labor to take its place. This will be the result, and it is often the conscious motive, of most of our so-called educational reforms.

Now the Socialist is the only man who can deal with the problems of modern education from the viewpoint of democracy, or with reference to the well-being and future of the worker. In England, this has been done by members of the Fabian Society, as well as most ably by the members of the Social Democratic Federation.

What Mr. Hyndman has done so magnificently and comprehensively for India, and what Mr. Simons has in like manner done for Socialism in his treatment of the problem of the American farmer, may be repeated in every field of current discussion. No matter how incidental to capitalist development a current problem may be, nor how its importance to the capitalist mind may be out of all proportion to its importance to the socialist mind, each problem presents an opportunity and a platform for Socialist education and propaganda.

## V.

It is the Socialist who must explain, both to the public and to the trade unions, the real significance of trade unionism and its development. The more far-seeing capitalists are losing no time in giving their own interpretation of trade union development to organized labor, while Mr. Parry and his organization, as well as like organizations, are internationally concerting for its extermination. But the shrewder Mr. Hanna, and the more comprehensive type of capitalist mind, have sought the direction of trade unionism; while political adventurers of the type of Mr. Hearst and Mr. Roosevelt—the latter being much the more far-seeing of the two—will accept the trade union for personal political ends. But it is Mr. Hanna's idea, and the highly organized capitalist interests, that will succeed. They represent the necessity of capitalist adaptation. They know better, or will learn better, than to undertake the destruction of the trade union; and they are not interested in mere political adventure. They are only interested in seizing upon, and adapting themselves to, inevitable social developments in order to use them for continued capitalist exploitation. They are prepared to use the trade union exactly as they use the various national governments or the Roman Catholic Church. I have already said that Mr. Hanna and Mr. Gompers had more influence with organized labor than

Mr. Debs. And through Mr. Hanna and Mr. Gompers, as well as through the good Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Morgan or Mr. Rockefeller can become the directive force in trade union development. Thus we have not only the danger, but already the beginnings, of an alliance between combinations of capital and some of the more highly organized trades for the sharing of the profits to public exploitation.

Now the only man who can meet, or possibly match, the capitalist, in educating and directing trade unionism, is the socialist. He alone knows what trade unionism means; knows its relation to the industrial development of the past and of the future. Only the Socialist can point out the benefits and the dangers of trade unionism to the worker.

On the one side, it is the trade unionist who is on the firing line of the class struggle. He it is who has blocked the wheels of the capitalist machine; he it is who has prevented the unchecked development of capitalist increase; he it is who has prevented the whole labor body of the world from being kept forever at the point of mere hunger wages; he it is who has taught the workers of the world the lesson of solidarity, and delivered them from that wretched and unthinking competition with each other which kept them at the mercy of capitalism; he it is who has prepared the way for the co-operative commonwealth. On the other hand, trade unionism is by no means the solution of the worker's problem, nor is it the goal of the labor-struggle. It is merely a capitalist line of defense within the capitalist system. Its existence and its struggles are necessitated only by the existence and predatory nature of capitalism.

It is the Socialist who should point out the ethics of the sympathetic strike, and especially of the almost desperate opposition of organized to unorganized labor, when the latter would supplant the former in the jobs that are vacated during the strike. The organized worker is really fighting the battles of the unorganized. His instinct is truer in this respect than the intelligence of either worker or capitalist. The unorganized worker who takes the job of the trade union striker does not see that he is committing economic as well as moral suicide. The primal thing upon which the continuous development of capitalism depends is that of having a large army of unorganized and defenseless workers to throw into competition with labor that is organized and defensive. The whole pressure of capitalism is towards forcing the average of workers to the level of the lowest-paid and worst-conditioned worker. The unorganized worker who takes his fellow-worker's job is capitalism's best ally in the perpetual degradation of the whole labor-body. He enforces and re-enforces the

tendency of the working world to descend to the level of its lowest paid and lowest conditioned; while the striking and organized worker is struggling to lift up the unorganized and defenseless labor; lift up the common labor to the level of labor's best conditioned. The striker is struggling, not only for himself and his fellow-strikers, but for the very economic and moral life of the "scab" whom capitalism uses to defeat the striker. Organized labor has an instinct that far outraches its intelligence, and that far outreaches the intelligence of the preaching and teaching class,—the instinct that the workers of the world are bound up together in one common destiny; that their battle for the future is one; and that there is no possible safety or extrication for any worker unless all the workers of the world are extricated and saved from capitalism together. The familiar assertion of the right of the individual worker to take his striking fellow-worker's place, to work when and where he pleases, is founded upon a frightfully destructive and unthinking falsehood. The position is essentially immoral and is indeed an unapprehended form of race suicide. And it is for the Socialist to point out both the economics and the ethics of the strike, to the capitalist as well as to the labor mind.

Labor will enter politics, in one fashion or another, in spite of the capitalism represented by Mr. Hanna or Mr. Gompers. If the Socialist movement does not command the attention and support of the organized workers of the nation, then we must expect a national independent labor movement that shall become the mere field of political exploitation. It is upon this that Mr. Hearst has his eye, and probably Mr. Roosevelt as well, to say nothing of Mr. Bryan; and in the end, capitalism will ask nothing better. For the independent labor party will be the gain of ambitious and discredited politicians, the negotiator of compromises with capitalism, and the bearer of disappointment, disaster and darkness, unless the Socialist movement should be the directing soul of that party.

We have reached that point where there is no possible solution of the problem of labor save in the common labor of the world taking over to itself its whole product, as well as all productive resources and machinery. A system which is the organization of a fundamental lie and injustice cannot be so reformed or improved or conditioned as to make the lie and injustice tolerable or secure. The public ownership of the post-office, of the railways, or of public utilities, under the capitalist order and government of things, will only serve to perpetuate the wrong and wretchedness of the system. Public ownership under capitalism is merely an extension of capitalist ownership. The United States postal service, for instance, is administered primarily for the profit of the railway corpora-

tions, and less and less for the service of the people. We cannot have socialistic reforms or conditions without having the whole of Socialism. Until the workers shall become a clearly defined Socialist movement, standing for and moving toward the unqualified co-operative commonwealth, while at the same understanding and procuring their immediate interests, they will only play into the hands of their exploiters, and be led by their betrayers.

It is the Socialist who must point this out in the right way. He is not to do this by seeking to commit trade union bodies to the principles of Socialism. Resolution or commitments of this sort accomplish very little good. Nor is he to do it by taking a servile attitude towards organized labor, nor by meddling with the details or the machinery of the trade unions. Not by trying to commit Socialism to trade unionism, nor trade unionism to Socialism, will the Socialist end be accomplished. It is better to leave the trade unions to do their distinctive work, as the workers' defense against the encroachments of capitalism, as the economic development of the worker against the economic development of the capitalist, giving unqualified support and sympathy to the struggles of the organized worker to sustain himself in his economic sphere. But let the Socialist also so build up the character and harmony and strength of the Socialist movement as a political force, that it shall command the respect and confidence of the worker, irrespective of his trade or his union obligations. It is urgent that we so keep in mind the difference between the two developments that neither shall cripple the other. The Socialist movement, as a political development of the workers for their economic emancipation, is one thing; the trade union development, as an economic defense of the workers within the capitalist system, is another thing. Let us not interfere with the internal affairs of the trade unions, or seek to have them become distinctively political bodies in themselves, any more than we would seek to make a distinctive political body in itself of a church, or a public school or a lawyer's office. But let us attend to the harmonious and commanding development of the Socialist political movement as the channel and power by which labor is to come to its emancipation and its commonwealth. At the same time let us give every economic and moral assistance to every labor struggle or strike; not make these an opportunity for propaganda or party exploitation, but as Socialists helping the workers to the one end of victory in the strike or struggle. In this sense, the Socialist party must know how to lose itself in order to find itself.

Under all circumstances, Socialism will have to accomplish its mission through co-operation with the experience of the

working class; through the daily needs and facts, the struggles and recurring crises, that are developing labor's solidarity. Politically empowered labor will make blunders, without doubt; it will be tyrannical at times, and often misled; but this is but a result of the varied forms of slavery in which it has been trained. The workers of the world must have experience in freedom before they can learn the processes by which freedom is to bring forth its world-harmony. Besides, they who produce what the world lives upon have a right to achieve their emancipation for themselves in their own way; and we who live upon their labor must be content to work with that way. It is better that they should make their way to freedom through blunder on blunder, than that some unreal freedom should be handed down to them. We must therefore make sure, when we as Socialists come to the working class, that we come as the servants of its own struggle for emancipation; and make doubly sure that we do not come seeking to use its struggles for the accomplishment of ambitious ends of our own.

## V.

The Socialist movement must come speaking the language of the people, the familiar accents of the daily life, and not come in the mere language of economic dogma. We have become almost as prone as the priests to rehearse traditional phrases, very often not knowing the meaning of the phrases we use. Instead of dealing with the facts and conditions before our eyes, in the language of the common life, we repeat abstract propositions that neither capitalist nor working-man understands. We give the impression that Socialism is a social theory to be imposed instead of an explanation of society and its struggles. No matter how profound our philosophy or propositions, we must state them in the terms and words that the people use in work and business if we expect the people to understand us. The effect or authority of a statement is not to be measured by the pretentiousness of its wording. The social revolution will not come through the constant reiteration and re-translation of the doctrines of Marx. It is not to come by declaring from lecture-room, or street corner, or propaganda tract, that there is but one social revolution, and that Marx is its prophet. Nobody tried harder to make clear the need of adaptation in Socialist effort and phraseology than Engels. And it is adaptation we must learn —learn to set forth the principles and facts of Socialism in a very human language. It is, indeed, rather remarkable that we who have insisted that Socialism must come as a working class movement, should go to the working class with a language that is academic; and that we should train the working-

man to attempt to reach his fellow-workers through an academic phrasing, through a Socialist orthodoxy, that is really meaningless to the educated classes themselves. Socialism is not coming as an orthodoxy, but as a breaking forth of fresh life upon the world. It is the break of human spring-time, after the long winter of human slavery. Its language must be as fresh, as sweet to human hearts and hopes, as the first words of the child, or the first bloom of the lilac or the rose.

One result of this persistence in a language that is academic, has been the fatal assumption of the inevitability of Socialism, which I deplored in the beginning of this paper. We have dethroned the other world Super-God of the churches, merely to enthroned a god of economic development in his place, and to rely upon this god of economic development to achieve for us what we must achieve for ourselves. The whole fatality of human history is this waiting of man for something to do for him that which he only can do for himself. It matters not whether it be a god, or a so-called natural law, or an economic development, or a ruling class, or or what it be—so long as man depends on something outside of himself to bear him to liberty and social perfection, or to bring liberty and social perfection to him, he will continue his way through failure and disappointment. Freedom can never be handed down to man by some invisible power in nature, or in the heavens, or in economic development, any more than it can be handed down by one class unto another class. A freedom achieved for man, even by natural forces or economic law, a freedom achieved in any way independent of man's cooperative choice, would result in paralysis and decadence. The opportunity of nature, the underlying motive of Socialism, is the creation of a social will in the common life that shall direct evolution toward a humanly elected destiny.

To this end, must our American movement translate its efforts and appeals into the terms of American life and experience. This principle of adaptation requires no compromise in the fundamentals of Socialist philosophy. It merely requires that we speak a language, that we work with means, which the country we live in may understand. Our American development and experience have been very different from the experience of the European nations. Our American habit of mind is very different from that of Europe. I am by no means saying that our habit of mind is more desirable than that of Europe; I am merely saying that if we are to change the American mind into a Socialist mind, we must appeal

to mental states that actually exist in the American, and make our Socialism intelligible to his way of looking at things.

For instance, American institutions and history pivot upon the idea of individual liberty. However false we have been to the idea, however hypocritical or servile we may have become before private wealth, it is still true that our political and industrial experience has been that of the glorified and independent individuality. Now Socialism should come to American life as the real and ransomed individualism. We should present Socialism as the co-operation of all men for the individual liberty of each man. We should send forth the Socialist as the herald and defender of the American liberty which has been so betrayed by capitalist politics and teachings. We should seize the sentiment and dynamic which imperialism has thrown away. We should come proclaiming the Socialist movement as the savior of our lost liberties. We should set forth economic co-operation as a means to the end of complete individual liberty for all men.

## VII.

As Socialists, we need to give more attention to questions of efficiency. Martin Luther used to declare that the devil had all the good music and the Christians all that was not fit to sing; and it sometimes seems that capitalism has all the efficiency of administration, and the Socialist movement all the inefficiency and bungling. If we are to present a coherent and conquering front before organized capitalism, we must learn how to so make use of our forces that the right man will be given the right work to do. It is not enough for a man to ostentatiously proclaim himself a Socialist, in order to give him the administration of the party, or the editorship of a newspaper. Some things are necessary to the power and success of the Socialist movement besides merely being a Socialist. The success of the movement depends upon the efficiency of organization and administration, as well as upon subscription to Socialist doctrines. We shall never get anywhere through misplaced responsibility, misdirected activity and badly organized public meetings. We must learn how to find a work for each comrade, that is true; but we must learn some sense in giving the work of administration to men who have been fitted by some sort of experience and training to do it. The wonder is that the Socialist movement grows so rapidly with so much bad management. We must learn from capitalism to put a premium upon efficiency; learn to give the various posts of service to men who are fitted to efficiently fill them.

For instance, if a speaker is sent for to come some hundreds of miles to speak at a mass meeting, it is not good sense

or efficient propaganda to have him preceded by some half dozen local speakers, so that when he arises to speak it is to a jaded and impatient audience, which he must keep until nearly midnight if he is to deliver his message. And the familiar plea that this must be done in order to be democratic, and to avoid personal jealousies, is a wretched reflection upon the comrades themselves. Democracy does not consist in the equal balancing of utterly petty and puerile jealousies. I cannot for a moment believe that such jealousies exist, nor can I think that any number of comrades have so stupid a notion of democracy. If I did, I should despair of what would happen if Socialism should come into power.

And, in every sort of a way, inefficient and disintegrating management, or rather hopeless mismanagement, has marked so much of our Socialist effort, that it is time we began to learn that the success of our movement depends upon efficiency of method and organization, as well as upon noise or soundness of economic doctrine.

### VIII.

The Socialist can no longer neglect what we might call the ethical or spiritual appeal. Our healthy distrust of mere sentimentalism, our certain knowledge of the disasters of Utopianism, has led us too far from the flaming altar at the heart of our Socialist movement. That altar is the sense of justice in the common life. It is to this sense of justice we must appeal, if we are to evoke the cleansing revolutionary flame that is to purify the world. It is upon the burning and obvious righteousness of our cause that we must depend for its power to conquer. The Socialist movement must have a spirit as well as a body; it must have a soul inside of its economics. It must take the place of the old religions in its power to command the exalting faith and devotion of the people. Socialism may translate into life, into world-creating energy, that aspiration and idealism which religions have absorbed and robbed the world of. The instinct of justice, the yearning for a universal well-being, the desire for social perfection, is deep in the life of the common man. It is for the Socialist to draw upon this human fund of spiritual instinct and turn it to account. We must show that the economic basis of Socialism is also the sole ground of spiritual liberation and fellowship; the soil out of which ransomed love must grow and blossom in the life of man.

Our movement is founded upon the question of bread, it is true, but not because we hold that man lives by bread alone. It is that until the bread question is solved, through the free and equal access of all men to the means of life, every other question is but a part of the grand evasion, a part of the

universal impudence, of the world's teachers. It means that until all men have free and abundant bread, no man may begin to fully and freely live. The quality of our economic distribution is the true measure of our spiritual quality. Equality and abundance of bread are the test and source of brotherhood and real spirituality. The Socialist affirms that the question of bread, the question of economic freedom and justice, is the most commanding spiritual task to which man has ever been summoned. Socialism is the spiritualization of the world. It comes as the first actual program for the liberation of the human spirit. For to own another's bread, is to own his soul. They who own the sources and tools of production and distribution, who own the things upon which the people depend, are the substantial owners of the world's thoughts, its laws, its social affections. To try to make a good world, while ignoring the economic basis of life, is but to be a hypocrite and a trifler. The way in which the world gets its work done, the manner and ratio of distributing the products of that work, the equality or inequality of bread and opportunity, are the real and only indices of the world's spiritual or ethical quality. We must show that our economic philosophy is the first actual demand that has ever been made upon man for a practical and common righteousness. We must show to the people, who have so long accepted what is as sacredly right, that the present kinds of righteousness are founded upon brute force, upon sheer economic might; that what is, is might, not right. We must show that, up to the present time, all that the world has called right has been founded in might, and show how the hid and almost unuttered common might must be changed into a righteousness of an altogether new kind. We must proclaim that it is not right that the few are degraded by their over-much, and the many wasted and blighted by the wretched little which they have won by anxiety and struggle; that it is not right that some people should own the things upon which all people depend; that there can be no basis for right living in a society that is the arena of economic competition and inequality.

No one but the Socialist is in a position which gives him any right to appeal to the sense of right. No one but the Socialist can lay the basis and prepare the human soil for a righteousness that shall be real. It is therefore urgent that we should not neglect, much less scorn, the appeal which is ours, and only ours, to the sense of righteousness in the people. It is ours to feed the altar fire at the heart of the Socialist movement until the purified world shall walk in the light of it.

## IX.

Is the human world great enough to match the greatness of its approaching opportunity? Does the spiritual fund that the centuries have accumulated bulk large enough to carry us through the door into the new world which the crisis of capitalism will open? Will mankind go back into the melting-pot, into new dark ages, and history enter another cycle of suffering and preparation? Or shall we enter the world of co-operative labor, of the fellowship that shall bear us beyond our sordid good and evil, of the ransomed love that shall make each human life a world-ecstacy?

It is the Socialist only who can answer this question; and no such question has ever been placed before man; no such test or trial of human worth has ever weighed the quality of men. It is the question which is to weigh the worth of the Socialist movement. If we have the power to be democratic, without being factional and petty; if we have the power to be mobile and fluid in our politics, without evasion or compromise; if we seek the triumph of the Socialist movement, and not merely the triumph of a political party in the name of Socialism; if we have power to forget ourselves in the hope of the good that is to come to the whole; if our effort is toward the creation of power in the people and not the gaining of power **over** the people; if the Socialist movement shall present to the world an altogether new and nobler quality of man;—then may we become the creators of the new world wherein dwelleth the justice of love, and its universal liberty.

GEORGE D. HERRON.

## A Municipal Socialist Congress in France.

**A**MUNICIPAL Socialist Congress was held in January, at Paris, presided over by Comrade Fourniere. Six hundred and fifteen municipalities were represented by seventy-five delegates.

The work had been divided among six committees as follows:

1. Committee on municipal program.
2. Committee on municipal relief.
3. Committee on municipal administration.
4. Committee on the working out of a typical municipal budget.
5. Committee on the abolition of octrois.
6. Committee on various propositions.

The discussions were very interesting; unfortunately owing to lack of space we can only sum them up and indicate the resolutions that were adopted.

### THE QUESTION OF THE OCTROIS.\*

Through its chairman the committee declared that the suppression of the octrois is desirable, but that it will not be completely obtained without the establishment of a system emancipating the proletarians and establishing a tax on income and inheritances. It is necessary to solve the question according to the best interests of the workers and to the local circumstances.

Comrade Bounet asked that in the Socialist program the suppression of the octrois be clearly indicated. The octrois are no longer retained by any European nations except France and Italy. He disagreed with the chairman and held that the means of suppressing the octrois should be put at the disposal of the municipalities, and that to this end we should demand of the government a system of taxes permitting the municipalities to carry on their activity while taking the burden off the laborers.

It was voted to refer back the report to the committee.

### THE QUESTION OF HYGIENE.

Henri Turot presented his report on laborers' dwellings. This question needs to be solved, and at Paris it seems to be near a solution. A committee there has the matter in charge. It is necessary to encourage private initiative, and it is also necessary that the municipality take the initiative.

\* The octroi is a tax levied by a municipal government on articles, particularly food, brought into the city. It is thus an indirect tax which bears most heavily on the poor.  
—Translator.

He explained the Charnay plan, which can be realized by a loan secured upon the rents to be received. But Charnay wished the tenants to profit by a reduction of rent even to the point of gratuity. The committee thought, on the contrary, that the rent ought to afford a surplus for the construction of new houses, and it modified the Charnay plan in that direction. It adopted the following resolution:

The congress invites the Socialists elected to municipal offices to study carefully the question of inexpensive dwellings for laborers.

Without opposing the encouragement of private initiative on the part of the municipalities, it expresses the wish that the cities themselves resolve to devote at least part of their resources to the building of laborers' dwellings, and that they make a study of financial measures which may result in prompt solutions.

Finally the congress resolved that the Socialists elected to parliament ought to endeavor to secure the modification of such laws as might throw obstacles in the way of these attempts on the part of the municipalities.

The report of the committee was unanimously adopted with the addition of the words, "Immediate reduction in the rate of rents," from Charnay's proposition.

A certain number of propositions presented by Parrasols, mayor of Sainte-Florine, relative to the approaching congress and to the establishment of a national federation of Socialist municipal councilmen and of a federal bureau of judicial and administrative information, were adopted, as well as a proposition of Dr. Bertrand asking that the new streets of large cities be planted with trees.

#### MUNICIPAL RELIEF.

René Boumet, chairman of the committee, held that the present relief is only a mockery, and he formulated, as follows, the things desired by the committee:

1. Relief to infants.
2. Relief to children from 3 to 13 years (school restaurants).
3. Relief to the aged and those disabled from work; hospital service at home.
4. Distribution of temporary relief for those out of work or ill, under the care of mutual relief bureaus.
5. Organization of medical relief by the establishment of dispensaries for temporary hospital service, with the free supply of urgently needed medicines; medical visits at home and hospital treatment in serious cases.
6. Finally, immediate secularization of all hospitals.

Orry thought it best to strike out the paragraph referring

to assistance to those out of work, which in his opinion ought to be assured by the unions and labor exchanges.

Bounet opposed Orry's amendment and expressed the opinion that the assistance of the state is still too far from realization, while the assistance of the municipalities can be determined upon tomorrow by the Socialist municipal councils.

Fourniere was also of the opinion that relief to those out of work should not be included in the municipal budget. The municipality in certain cases will not be able to meet its obligations. Relief of this kind degrades the workers to the level of beggars.

Tessier supported Orry's proposition but preferred that the municipal councils assist the unions for a special out-of-work fund, but Comrade Bourdet observed that the prefect would not authorize this disposition of municipal funds.

The report of the committee was adopted unanimously.

#### HYGIENE OF DWELLINGS.

On this complex question Colly apologized for offering only a few ideas. He reminded the congress of what had been decided in 1898 at the congress of Fumay. The law on public sanitation demanded by that congress was voted in July, 1902, but all know with what difficulty laws of this sort are often applied. The mayors have the right and even the duty to take measures intended to assure hygienic conditions and public health. This is accordingly a law which attacks the famous principle of the inviolability of property.

The committee therefore considers that the mayors ought to use all the rights conferred upon them by the law of July, 1902.

The question of water especially has great importance. The law of 1902 imposes upon all municipalities the duty of supplying water fit for drinking. The prefects are instructed to watch over the execution of these regulations and are given the necessary power. That is a fortunate provision of the law, since it permits the Socialist minorities to insist on the law being respected by the reactionaries, who care little for the health of the working people.

In the country the residents often have little care for the matter of hygiene; the water supply, the sewage and the dwellings are often very defective. The law ought to permit the compulsory cleaning of certain houses.

It is a sad thing, said Colly, poetically, to see on the slopes of our laughing hills, villages making blotches like a blotch of mud on the petal of a rose; fortunately the purity of the breeze serves as an antiseptic for our peasants.

I declare, he added, that only in the Republican party and especially the Socialist party, do we find any concern for the public

health. We have seen this at Paris on the subject of the vote on the sanitary regulations elaborated by Navarre, which was rejected by the nationalist majority, but which the committee of the department of hygiene afterwards voted in its entirety. Dr. Bertrand explained that in the schools, not enough care is taken regarding questions of hygiene, and that washstands and shower-baths ought to be in all the schools. If hygienic regulations are to be well applied it is necessary to establish a bureau of public health, it is necessary to unify these services. The respect for private property is also a great obstacle to sanitary measures. Private property, in certain cases, is not only fatal to those who enjoy it, it is still more so to those who live near it if it is contaminated. It is also necessary to provide for the education of the people in hygiene, and the only way to arrive at this is by giving hygiene a very prominent place in school programs.

#### PUBLIC SERVICES.

Charnay offered a resolution on this subject which was opposed by Brousse and Camelle. Brousse said that on the day when public services should be made free for the laborers it would certainly be necessary to look elsewhere for means to pay the cost of operation of the free services. Certainly, if the tax on real estate were increased we should see the proprietors shifting the charge upon the tenants. If gas were supplied at cost we should be in danger of seeing an injury to such public services as instruction and relief, which are of a more immediate and more general necessity. There are free public services which we ought to enlarge constantly and others which we ought to establish, but we must at the same time assure ourselves of public services that shall be of advantage to the finances of the municipality.

Camelle proposed to decide that the price of gas for Paris should be, for example, fifteen or twenty centimes as a general rule, and that below a certain rate of rent this price should be lowered in a proportion to be fixed upon. In the same way, at the hours when the labor day begins and ends, there are street railways which reduce their rates; why should we wish to share the advantage with the rich, especially if it is a public service? It is necessary to increase the charges on the bourgeoisie for the advantage of the laborers.

Charnay wished to have it stated by the congress that the profit made on public services is an indirect tax. The adjustment of the scale of prices for gas, as well as for transportation, ought to be managed in such a way as to cost the community nothing. It is the consumers themselves who ought to pay the expenses of this management. To transform an enterprise into

a public service, is not to make a present to the consumers, since this service requires no new sacrifice on the part of the community.

At Paris as regards the transportation service when it shall be scheduled, the city will make a profit of at least five centimes. It is the poor who use it the most, consequently they are the ones who will be hit, it is an indirect tax. You have the right to make it, but it ought to be avowed frankly, with the assertion that indirect taxes are less burdensome to the working class than direct taxes.

Daveau, of Ivry, spoke to the same effect as Brousse and said that the taxes on proprietors really fall upon the tenants; to guard against this it will be necessary to prevent the proprietors from raising rents, but the law does not authorize us to fix this limit.

Colly cited the example of the Metropolitan, where the establishment of two classes of travelers hits the luxurious and is really an actual tax on the rich.

The presiding officer, Blondel, thought there was a misunderstanding. Charnay does not ask that we immediately give up all profits from public services. As for the matter of water and education, those who have no property are not obliged to pay anything, and if lighting is considered as a luxury it is precisely because a high price is charged for it; as soon as the municipalities themselves furnish gas or electric lighting, what today is a luxury will be tomorrow something to be used by everyone. Charnay is speaking more for the future than for the present. Have you the right to levy an indirect tax on those who have no property? You are drawing from the pockets of those who possess nothing, to put into the pocket of all, the rich as well as the poor. You ought to put the means of transportation at cost to everyone, and you have no right to levy any sort of indirect tax.

Charnay then modified his proposition to read as follows:

Whereas, The tax levied on public services over and above the cost price, for the benefit of the municipality, is an actual indirect tax bearing upon all the laborers.

Resolved, That public services be organized in such a way that their benefits be assured at cost to all laborers.

Comrade Brousse read a resolution which was merely a summary of his remarks. This resolution was adopted and that of Charnay was rejected.

#### THE MUNICIPAL PROGRAM.

The following project was adopted:

I. On the political side:

Municipal autonomy for all acts relating to the community.

Extension of the recognized right of municipalities to establish inter-municipal unions.

Right to apply the referendum.

Legal provisions for salaries to municipal councilmen.

II. On the economic side:

Municipalization of public services pertaining to the community, as transportation, lighting, water-supply, etc.

Limitation to eight hours of the work-day of all municipal employees and laborers, weekly rest-day, minimum wage fixed on the basis established by the labor unions of the district.

Introduction into contracts for public works of clauses imposing these conditions; prohibition of truck store system.

Appointment by municipalities, on the recommendation of the labor unions, of inspectors whose duty should be to supervise the enforcement of the prescribed conditions of labor in all public works, whether operated by the municipalities themselves or by contracts with private parties.

Provision to be made, by payments to the national pension fund, for pensions to municipal laborers and those employed on municipal contracts.

Improvement of the special conditions accorded by the municipalities to the Socialist co-operatives of production.

Suppression of private employment bureaus and establishment of free municipal employment bureaus under the control of the labor exchanges of labor unions.

Municipal aid to the labor exchanges, labor unions and out-of-work benefit funds, in proportion to the number of members.

III. On the financial side:

Suppression of the octrois and their replacement by taxes or duties not burdening the laborers in any way.

Exemption from personal property tax for families paying small rents.

A municipal system of fire insurance.

Establishment of a municipal tax on transfers of lands and buildings proportional to the surplus value acquired by these lands and buildings over and above the labor cost of construction.

IV. Public education:

Free and secular instruction in all grades, and the establishment of professional schools.

Establishment of school restaurants, distribution of clothing, reform schools and boarding schools.

Provision for instruction in hygiene and the establishment of baths in the schools.

School supplies to be furnished free.

Municipal aid to secular higher education (libraries, societies for study and of graduate pupils, popular universities, etc.)

V. Public relief:

Distribution to those in need (the aged, women, children, the sick, the disabled, laborers out of work) of food, clothing and fuel at their homes.

Secularization of all lodging houses and hospitals.

Medical service and medicines free to those in need.

The aged and orphans to be cared for in families rather than in hospitals.

Temporary relief by payment of rent in cases of need, and the establishment of municipal lodging houses and storage warehouses for household goods.

The establishment of municipal day-nurseries and homes for children whose parents are temporarily absent, in hospitals, etc.

Establishment of relief for destitute mothers and children in proportion to the need.

#### VI. Public hygiene and dwellings:

Construction by the municipalities of healthful and low-priced dwellings.

The broadening of narrow streets.

Supervision of lodgings, work-shops, water-supply and food sold in the market.

No building permits to be issued to proprietors not conforming to hygienic regulations.

Suppression of the police des moeurs (equivalent to a police service for the "suppression of vice," evidently the abuses incident to this are the same in France as in America.—Translator.)

The various articles of this program were adopted as well as a number of resolutions.

Orry proposed to appoint a committee instructed to organize a federation of Socialist municipalities. This proposition was adopted, as well as a plan of the same author, to condense the work of the congress into a pamphlet and to make an appeal to the Socialist municipalities to cover the expenses of publication as well as those of the congress. This pamphlet should be ready before the elections and should be sent to all candidates requesting it.

The next meeting of the congress is fixed for 1905, to be held in the department of the Seine.

*Translated from L'Avenir Social by CHARLES H. KERR.*

## Annual Report of the National Secretary of the Socialist Party.

From January 1, 1903, to December 31, 1903.

OMAHA, Neb., Jan. 1, 1904.

*To the National Committee, Socialist Party:*

Comrades—I herewith submit my report as National Secretary covering the period from January 1, 1903, to December 31, 1903, inclusive.

The month of January, 1903, was included in former Secretary Greenbaum's term of office, and in the interval between then and my assumption of office on February 10, National Committeeman Samuel Lovett, of South Dakota, was in charge as Acting Secretary.

### STATE AND TERRITORIAL ORGANIZATIONS.

There are now thirty-three state and territorial organizations affiliated with the national party. These are Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia and Wisconsin.

Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Vermont and West Virginia were chartered during the year.

The Utah organization was declared not in good standing and its charter revoked by the National Committee on November 10 for non-payment of dues from July, 1902.

### LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS.

During the year 101 new locals were chartered direct by the national office in unorganized states and territories distributed as follows: Alabama, 10; Arkansas, 14; Arizona, 5; Delaware, 1; Georgia, 6; Indian Territory, 12; Louisiana, 10; Maryland, 3; Mississippi, 1; Nevada, 1; North Carolina, 6; Rhode Island, 1; South Carolina, 2; Tennessee, 8; Utah, 1; Virginia, 4; West Virginia, 9; Wyoming, 6, and the District of Columbia, 1.

The thirty-three locals chartered in Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Louisiana and West Virginia have since been merged into the state organizations formed in those states. During the quarter ending December 31, fifty-three locals paid dues to the national office.

### FINANCIAL.

The total receipts of the national office from all sources during

the year were \$14,240.99, with expenditures of \$14,072.55, leaving a balance of \$168.44.

The receipts show that \$9,946.06 was for national dues, of which amount \$9,223.61 came from state and territorial organizations, and \$722.45 from locals and members-at-large in unorganized states and territories.

The average payment for each month of the year was, therefore, upon 15,373 members in the organized states and territories and upon 602 in the remainder, or an average of 15,975 members for each month of the year. The average payment per month during 1902 was upon 10,000 members.

The following table shows the number of members for whom dues were paid during the respective months of the year:

January .....	14,223	July .....	17,296
February .....	11,939	August .....	17,014
March .....	14,565	September .....	14,559
April .....	16,458	October .....	20,556
May .....	12,246	November .....	17,404
June .....	11,472	December .....	24,048

There is now due the national office from the various organizations, \$1,417.09, for due stamps and supplies. While some of these accounts are for stamps obtained on credit for use during the current month, yet at least \$1,200 of the indebtedness extends over a period of several months, and in some cases for the entire year.

If the actual amount collected for dues by a number of state secretaries during the year had been remitted to the national office the average membership per month would have shown an increase equal to that amount. It is but fair to assume that the actual number of members affiliated with the national organization at this time is not less than 23,000.

#### NATIONAL ORGANIZING FUND.

The call for contributions to the National Organizing Fund realized \$2,509.51. Of this amount, \$620 was contributed direct for organizing purposes to various state organizations. The remainder, \$1,889.51, was expended through the national lecturers and organizers, with the addition of \$1,277.63 received for dues, making a total of \$3,687.14.

The grand total expended by the national office alone for organizing during the year was therefore \$3,796.34, exclusive of postage, telegrams and expressage.

This sum, however, does not cover the entire amount used for agitation and organization purposes; \$4,732.65 was collected direct by the lecturers and organizers themselves through lecture fees, collections and donations, making a total during the year of \$8,528.99.

WILLIAM MAILLY.

## Symposium on Convention.

### For Clear Cut Constitution and Platform.

**E**DITOR REVIEW: Below will be found an expression of opinion regarding answers to queries made. I answer in the order named and by number to save space:

First—A growing movement must always be elastic enough to fit itself to the needs that development demands. The Constitution of the Socialist Party, good today, might be almost worthless tomorrow. We are now crippled with an ambiguously worded constitution, and it needs a thorough revision that will bring our party machinery in harmony with the ever-changing conditions. Lack of clearness or specific declaration has compelled many needless referendums and much waste of good energy. Our national secretary should have behind him a constitution for guidance of his work so clear and clean-cut as to remove the last vestige of doubt. Such changes are needed as will tend to produce this result.

Second—A most important question. We should have most clear and definite party pronouncements governing our candidates and controlling their actions, but it should be a strictly *private* affair within our party, and *not* for means of public propaganda. A man nominated on the Socialist party ticket should know that the party is bigger than the man and that it means to control him. He should know in clear terms and in what manner the control would apply, and if it meets with his disapproval, then he can refuse to be a candidate.

Such a "program" should be separate from platform pronouncements and should be *private* for the guidance of our party members and not to invite the vote of half-baked reformers and sun-burnt Hearstites, who later must learn they have purchased a gold brick. All that can be accomplished under capitalism is almost *nil*. The world is not going to be revolutionized by resolutions or the proletariat brought to a state of class-consciousness of the class struggle by wordy mouthings of what we will do if our candidates are elected, when we know beforehand we can do none of these things. To the public the Socialist party can have but one program: The capture of the powers of government by the hitherto oppressed working class, that it may come to the full and complete ownership of the tool of production—capital. To get votes on any other proposition is to invite reaction. For the Socialist party to start out making glittering ante-election promises is to make of itself a joke. Hearsts and middle-class

democracy (?) have possession of a more complete encyclopaedia of adjectives, and they have nothing to lose but their reputations (now worthless), and many rich government offices to gain. We have but one aim, the Social Revolution, and we must avoid the reactionary. If a man would come to our party ballot-box today because we *promise* much, he would go to the other fellow tomorrow because he *promised* more. It is only the class-conscious, rock-ribbed, dyed-in-the-wool proletariat that is worth anything to Socialism—the man who is once a Socialist, always a Socialist; not for office or power, nor for personal aggrandizement; not for satisfying of personal ambition, but because of the recognition of the class-struggle, and the recognition of the fact that *he* cannot be free until *all* are free, and that he who would be free must strike the first blow.

The "Art of Politics" and municipal program, ward physicians, etc., and so on, seems one and the same thing. We want behind every Socialist ballot a Socialist, and we better be forty years in the wilderness making *real* Socialists than to suffer defeat at the critical hour when we come to cross the River Jordan (kill capitalism) and enter Caanan land (the co-operative commonwealth) to find only that it has been the back-door to hell—and reaction.

Men will only come to a realization of the class struggle as the competitive warfare shall press harder and harder upon them. Better one hundred suffer and die today to bring revolution and life to the whole class than that failure follow tomorrow on today's mushroom growth, and appeals to the voter on a lot of empty promises that can never be fulfilled and which would sap the energy of the revolutionary government to *try* to carry out.

It will take quite as much energy to persuade a capitalist voting mule to vote a "program" Socialist ballot as it will to make a revolutionary one. In the first he blows with the wind, and will be gone tomorrow. In the second, the work is complete, and he has learned the real underlying directing forces of social life.

Third—Every propaganda center should have a "propaganda committee" of well-informed, well-balanced Socialists, whose duty it should be to see and know that each public speaker (or writer) should be competent to teach; effective in manner, and of enough gentlemanly (or womanly) character to guarantee respectable and proper treatment to the public. This committee should have also discretionary power to aid in harmonizing public declarations on fundamental lines, so that the whole voice of the propaganda would ring true to our revolutionary program.

Fourth—Partly answered above. The party in annual convention might with propriety pass resolutions of direction or

suggestion to party speakers, and on matters of great importance give clear and emphatic utterance to the position of the party thereto. The combined membership of the party should be and is wiser than the individual.

Fifth—They (the farmers) belong to the exploited class of producers, and all that is needed is the defining of our philosophy in terms that can be comprehended by them. They are a larger voting factor than the purely industrial worker, and if we appeal to the latter to help him "see" much greater is the need that we point the "way of escape" for the farmer. What folly to everlasting "program" for the city industrialist and forget the agrarian "wage" worker. He must be shown wherein and "how" Socialism will benefit him, and we need to enlarge our vocabulary to the extent of remembering that there are vastly greater things "than heretofore have been told" in our philosophy respecting the farmer. Socialism cannot be a factor at the polls until the farmer makes it so. The common platform of exploitation is broad enough and strong enough to hold all—farmer and city worker, trade unionist and scab, Jew and Gentile, negro and Italian, Irishman and German, and many of these are "from Missouri," and it is up to our Revolutionary Party to "show" them where their interests lie. We cannot and must not beg the question.

Sixth—Yes, but in mentioning one class we must not forget "there are others." (See No. 5.) The organization on the industrial field for an alleviation of present needs is a splendid place in which to work out "immediate demands." Then organization on the political field, as expressed by the Socialist Party, is the place to get busy in "real" work. If the Union is a place where the worker may have something to say regarding wages, hours and conditions of his labor, then the Socialist Party movement is the place where this same worker may find it possible to have all to say about the product of his toil.

"Workingmen of the world, unite (at the ballot box); you have nothing to lose but your chains (of slavery to a job) and a world to gain."

CHARLES L. BRECKON.

## The Farmer A Worker.

**T**HREE is no need of any special expression of the Socialist Party toward the farmers. It is only necessary that it be recognized that the farmer is a worker—not a wage worker, but still a worker. And it is necessary, absolutely necessary, that it be recognized that Socialism *does not* appeal to the farmer from the same point of view as it does to the wage worker. The fundamental point of difference between the farmer and wage worker is that the farmer is indirectly exploited, while the wage worker is directly exploited. Also that while the wage worker has a personal representative of the competitive systems before him in the person, firm or corporation that he works for, the farmer has not. It is easy to arouse a personal feeling against the firm or corporation and then transfer it against the system while with the farmer it must be aroused against the system direct, which is very much harder. The farmer is beginning to see that the competitive system is wrong and he is trying to right it, as witness the Populist reform planks, free silver, etc. He does not see clearly yet, but perhaps as clearly as the average wage worker, and he is willing to learn, if Socialism is rightly presented to him.

The Socialist Party has thus far failed in presenting Socialism to the farmer, in that it has not done it in a way to touch his point of view. The speakers and writers of the Socialist Party have so far been mainly wage workers, union wage workers at that, and they have talked and written as they would to wage workers. Now the farmer is interested in shop regulation, unions, scabs, etc., just as he is in a flood in South America, or a famine in India; he sympathizes but he does not understand. The main point that should be emphasized to farmers, but which is seldom touched, is the need of organization. The average union speaker has become so accustomed to organization that he fails to understand that the farmers does not see the need of it. To him it has become second nature, and he takes it for granted that everyone else understands it also. The farmer, on the other hand, by his work, habits and education is taught that organization is not necessary, that what each man is depends on himself alone.

The farmer starts a piece of work and carries it through by himself from start to finish. By so doing he misses the object lesson that the wage worker has always before him; he does not have to depend on his fellow worker.

In short, it is necessary only that the farmer be shown, not that there is something wrong in the present workings of the competitive system, but that the system itself is wrong, and that it must be destroyed to do away with his troubles. He must be shown that an organization, such as the Socialist Party offers, is necessary to destroy the system. Show him this, and you have a clear, class-conscious Socialist who will stand by his fellow workers, both in the field or the shop, to the end, come what will.—*William Carpenter, Socialist and Farmer, Tulare, California.*

---

### A Referendum on the Platform.

**T**HE following referendum, even if it does not reach its final stage before the meeting of the National Convention, may serve to direct attention to these specific issues and obtain a more complete expression of opinion than is possible through the action of the convention:

WHEREAS, The outcome of the Social Revolution now in progress, depends largely on the unity of purpose and concentration of effort of the Socialist forces, to be secured only by the avoidance of prevarications and side issues, which breed dissensions and complications, and hamper and dwarf Socialist activity and ideals, be it

~ RESOLVED. That the principles of scientific and revolutionary Socialism stand as the basis of union and test of loyalty to the Cause in the Nation, leaving to individual opinion and belief matters not set forth in this politico-economic program, and to the several states such rights of adaptation of these principles that shall preserve strictly the revolutionary aim and character of the movement, and guard against fusion or compromise or alliance with, or endorsement of, any outside organization, whatever its name or pretensions, and

RESOLVED, That, in keeping with the position thus defined, we call for the omission of the "Immediate Demands" from the Party's National Platform, and the rescinding of the "Trades Union Resolutions" appended thereto; and that such action shall not be construed as implying any hostility to the Trades Unions, but as designed rather to relieve the Party and the Unions from the embarrassment and injustice of the confusion of the aims and methods of the two movements, while leaving the Unions, or to agitate among them as they see fit.

The experiences of Socialist history certainly teach the need of unity in essentials.

In the first place, it will be generally admitted, that all matters not specifically set forth in the party's platform should be left to individual opinion and belief; questions, for instance, of a strictly social, religious or philosophical import, though it may be true that in the last analysis the movement derives its higher sanction and deeper inspiration from these social domains of man's thought and life. The differences in temperament and training among Socialists require the largest freedom in the methods of argument and style of delivery of writers and speakers, as long as they hold to the main thesis. The doctrine of economic determination certainly is true, and of vast

importance in the Socialist scheme, but it may take the form of the narrowest of dogmas, cutting the mind off from those springs of power in the paths of the air, the regions of sentiment and imagination.

Whatever the serviceableness of the "immediate demands" may be, their value, even from the practical standpoint, is uncertain and variable, while they clash theoretically with some of the main contentions of Socialists; but, being allowed a place in the party's National Platform, they are made to partake of the supreme dignity and emphasis of basic principles, despite the cautionary words that accompany them. These "demands" are easily confused with fundamentals by the unwary, the unthinking and the designing, both inside and outside of our ranks. And it is not surprising that the Democratic and Union Labor parties claim to stand for all that is practicable in Socialism, when they can swallow the "demands" with but a slight change of phraseology. And as the "practical" politician works his way to the fore with the growth of the party, the "demands" will be looked upon as the *via sacra* of the movement (if they are not already felt by some to be its very backbone), and its scientific and revolutionary aspects will appear as wraiths from the land of dreams. Faithfulness to principle, however, does not mean the neglect of opportunity and scorn of the practical, of means fitted to present need and exigency, as long as a true valuation is placed on these attempts at graduated measure which circumstances invite or compel, and the shallows of the coast-line are not mistaken for the deep soundings of the outer sea. But this species of effort, along empirical lines, may be left to the several states, under a regulation policy determined by the party in National Convention and applied through a National Bureau.

The relation of the party toward the trade unions given in the two sets of "resolutions," made so conspicuous in the party press, is indefinite in the last degree, and, after so many attempts of this kind by experts in the business, the question is raised whether it is not time the experiment be made of a total abstention from all official pronunciamentos of this sort. These "resolutions" admit of a double interpretation that gives license to faction and the upper hand always to the ultra-trade unionist. Such experiences as those with the St. Louis Local Quorum and the Boston Convention of the A. F. of L. furnish proof as strong as anything short of a supernatural manifestation, of the need of a radical change in the party's trade-union policy. And this change of attitude need not be from one of friendliness to one of antagonism, like that of the Socialist Labor Party, by any means. There is far less overlapping of the interests of the two movements in this than in foreign countries. Here we have an immense territory, a mixture of races, equal suffrage and state governments, and a more advanced stage of industrial development. It

needs not be denied that the strike, boycott and label are something of a necessity in American life, but it does seem the very height of folly to seek to weld these methods to those of a revolutionary Socialist party, whose aim is the conquest of political power by means of the ballot, of the intelligent use of the rights of citizenship. And there are good grounds for believing that Socialists would have far more influence in trade union bodies if they did not come with a commission to capture them for the cause. And what do these convention "resolutions" favoring Socialism amount to, anyway? What fruits have they borne in Colorado, where the American Labor Union indorsed Socialism in the most express terms? The trade union constituency is a parti-colored mass, politically speaking, and of many nationalities and all degrees of intelligence; and there may be more un-wisdom in lugging politics into the union, no matter whose brand it is, than in trying to keep it out.

THEODORE CURTIS.

---

### An Official Working Program Separate from Platform.

**N**O changes can be made in the matter of party organization, in my opinion, which would be of special advantage at this time. Any change would be either in the direction of less or more autonomy of the different states. The present plan works well.

There should be an official working program adopted for the guidance of members elected to office. It should be separate from the platform, deal only with questions of paramount importance to the working class under capitalism; define the Socialist position clearly on these questions, and leave minor questions and details untouched. This should be an official propaganda document for campaigns and for inducing workmen to join the party.

If a speaker violates or denies the principles we stand for, give the matter the fullest publicity and leave the rest to the intelligence of the membership.

Uniformity in different cities on paramount issues will be secured by the working program. Uniformity on minor questions may not be desirable.

As to the farmers and negro employer of labor, no. As to the negro wage slave, yes. We should make it strong enough to drive every "nigger hater" out of the Socialist Party.

The resolution should be changed to read, "The trade-union movement and Socialist political movement, etc.," substituting the word "Socialist" for "independent." W.M. S. DALTON.

## The Farmer and the Negro.

**A**MONG other questions the Editor of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW asks me: "Should there be (by the National Convention) any special expression of our attitude toward the farmers and negroes?" In the first place it might be pointed out that our attitude toward the farmers and the negroes must be determined by entirely different considerations. When considering the farmers we consider a clearly defined economic question. Their numerical strength makes them a factor to be reckoned with in every plan looking toward the capture of the powers of government. They are devoted to the perpetuation of a republican form of government which in the present state of industry, can only be secured by the triumph of the principles for which the Socialist party stands. They are good fighters and they have felt the sting of capitalist arrogance and the lash of capitalist despotism. We want them and will welcome them if they come to fight with us, but I would oppose any special appeal to them which should involve any equivocation or concealment of the essentially proletarian character of the Socialist movement. Years ago the Omaha platform of the Populists declared that the interests of urban and rural labor are the same, but I am inclined to believe that this was more the expression of some Populist politician's desire to capture the urban laborer's vote rather than an evidence of Populist knowledge of the character and condition of the proletariat. The farmer and the proletarian are alike in that both are the victims of capitalist greed, and that is a bond of comradeship. This bond is being recognized but its strength depends on the clearness with which our farmer comrades perceive that freedom lies in progress toward industrial democracy. We cannot and should not forget that the peculiar economic status of the farmer makes him prone to regard favorably reactionary measures or some forms of State Socialism which promise relief to him but hold out nothing for the working class. There is no reason to doubt, however, that a large proportion of the farmers are able to appreciate the Socialist position and to realize the hopelessness of any real improvement in their condition under Capitalism. We want to reach this element, but I oppose embodying the appeal in our platform.

In my opinion, the Negro Resolution adopted by the Indianapolis convention in 1901 was a mistake. Not that we should shut the door in the face of the black man, but that the resolution was characterized by a sentimental—not to say hysterical—spirit. In effect it was an invitation to the "brother in black"

to come to our arms and receive a fraternal kiss. The negro, when he is intelligent enough to catch a glimmer of what Socialists are driving at, will come to us without a sentimental appeal. If he lacks intelligence he will misunderstand the appeal if he hears it and class it with the endearing call of the carpetbagger. As a race the negro worker of the South lacks the brain and the backbone necessary to make a Socialist. To make his case a special case is folly because he will return less dividends on the energy spent in converting him than probably any other worker on earth. Some of our comrades find great difficulty in keeping down their effervescent love for the black man, but common sense and not effervescence should characterize our party policies, and common sense can't endorse any special attempt to capture the negro. We are appealing to wage workers, and it is no particular concern of ours whether the wage worker is brown-eyed or blue-eyed, black or white. We deprecate race distinctions and then proceed to emphasize them by assuming that the race of the worker endows him with some peculiar status. Let us not make the mistake of mortgaging the future to make good our predictions concerning conditions under the Co-operative Commonwealth. It may be that our fair-skinned women will be Desdemona and prefer Othello for mates, and the fair-skinned men may emulate Solomon and take to Sheban spouses. Then again it may not be so. You never can tell.

CHARLES DOBBS.

---

### Develop Press and Literature.

I FAVOR the elimination of all "immediate demands" and the formulation of a "guide" or program for officials elected by our votes, as suggested recently by Comrade Unter-mann in a REVIEW article.

I would ignore the trades unions as such and stand the political movement on its own bottom. The negro and farmer propositions are of an entirely different character; we state their position under capitalism, not our "attitude" toward them.

I would abolish the "local quorum," repose more confidence and power in the national secretary, and require action by entire committee if indicated by the character of the matter in hand, or demanded by a certain number of the national committee.

I would abolish plural voting and give the states proportional representation in the national committee if something is required to prevent ill-advised action by immature members from "new" states or territories, which I much doubt. Certainly we are just about as liable to have such representation from any of the "older" states.

The upbuilding of the party press will be the speediest and surest method of regulating the "agitator" question, and probably the only practical or effective method. With the movement in its present condition and a crying demand for soap-boxers from every section, any volunteer will be hailed with acclaim; when the movement grows larger the field will attract grafters and fakirs, who will imagine it to afford an easy living. In either event, no effective control can be exercised; the best that can be done will be to "repudiate" and "protest"; as the movement becomes clear the locals will do that effectually themselves.

In my opinion, the main thing for Socialists to concentrate their energies upon is the creation and establishment of a powerful press and the distribution of scientific literature, such, for example, as that issued by our own co-operative publishing house, known as the Chas. H. Kerr & Co. Of only less importance is the organization of the party. The two should be inseparably connected, and, if so, no concern need be felt regarding the "control" of agitators; false or utopian propaganda cannot exist, much less flourish, where clear literature is sown.

"Whether the Socialist Party as a whole looks with favor upon the efforts which are frequently made to secure the adoption of resolutions by trade-union conventions endorsing the party" or not is immaterial. Such efforts will be made regardless of any action or declaration of the party, and the fact that they are so made is conclusive that the party "as a whole" has no "look" in the matter, and it should have none. Any convention declaration would only be cited by our opponents to prevent agitation—which is all such efforts amount to in any event—and agitation is as essential to our growth as air or water is to plants. Let the party stand as a party, and concern itself not with things with which it should have no concern. CHARLES HEYDRICK.

---

### The Trade Union Movement.

THE resolution adopted by the National Convention at Indianapolis, July, 1901, defining the attitude of the Socialist party towards the trade union movement must stand. It is in line with the sound policy of the International Social Democracy. Experience has demonstrated its correctness. The supplementary resolutions adopted at the National Committee meeting in January, 1903, are a compromise with a wrong policy; a compromise with the very tactics that have proven so detrimental to the entire Socialist and trade union movement in past years.

Theoretically, on paper, our party policy is correct. Practically, in our every day's struggles, many of our leading com-

rades are violating the fundamental policy of our party. They are violating the time-tried policy of our international Socialist movement. Their work is unsocialistic, because by their very action they wish to create the impression among the rank and file that they (i.e., these leading comrades) were destined to build a Solomon's temple of New Trade Unionism over night. These comrades—and Comrade Eugene V. Debs is one of them—commit the same blunder as Samuel Gompers, John Mitchell and other union leaders of the anti-Socialist variety. President Gompers says: "WE, WE, WE have built up this great trades union movement!"

Some of our Socialist leaders have the same delusive idea as Gompers and Mitchell. While they may not frankly express it, yet they think like this: "WE, WE, WE are the leading spirits possessed of the god-given power to create and build up a New Trade Unionism—a Socialist unionism!"

These friends of ours don't realize their unsocialistic position on this important question. We may find an opportunity to say more on this subject at some other time.

In 1896 the International Socialist Congress was held in London, England. That was at the time when Prof. De Leon's and Hugo Vogt's Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance was in full bloom. Said International Socialist Congress put itself on record on the trade union question as follows:

#### RESOLUTION.

"The trade union struggle of the wage workers is indispensable, in order to resist the encroachments of Capitalism and to improve the conditions of Labor under the present system. Without trade unions no fair wages and no shorter hours of labor. However, this economic struggle only lessens the exploitation, but does not abolish it. The exploitation of labor will cease when society takes possession of the means of production. This is conditioned on the creation of a system of legislative measures. To fully carry out these measures the working class must become the deciding political power. However, the working class will only become such a political power in the same ratio as its organization, the trade union, grows. By the very organization into trade unions the working class becomes a political factor.

"The organization of the working class is incomplete and insufficient so long as it is only political.

"But the economic (trade union) struggle also requires the political activity of the working class. Very often the working-men have to assert and permanently secure by their political power what they have wrung from their exploiters in the free economic struggle. In other cases the legislative gains make economic conflicts by trade union action superfluous. The in-

ternational co-operation of the working class on trade union lines, especially in regard to labor legislation, becomes more necessary in the same degree as the economic relations of the capitalistic world's market and the conflicts of the national industries develop.

"In accordance with the decisions of the International Socialist Congresses in Brussels and Zurich this congress declares that the organization of trades unions is an absolute necessity in the struggle of emancipation of the working class and we consider it as the duty of all wage workers who aim at the emancipation of labor from capitalist wage slavery to join the union of their respective trade.

*"The trades unions, in order to do effective work, shall be nationally organized and the splitting up of the elements in separate organizations is to be condemned. Political differences of opinion shall not be a cause for dividing or splitting up the forces in the economic struggle, but the proletarian class struggle makes it the duty for the labor organizations to educate their members in Socialist principles."*

Our Indianapolis resolution is in full accord with the above resolution of the London International Socialist Congress. The only amendment we might make would be to add: "Differences of political opinions shall not be a cause for dividing or splitting up the forces in the economic struggle of the trade union movement."

Differences of political opinions and a spirit of resentment were instrumental in giving birth to De Leon's Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance.

Differences of political opinions and a spirit of resentment were also instrumental in giving birth to a similar organization in Denver, Colo., a little over a year ago. Both "creations" were not the necessary result of economic conditions, but the work of a few men who were anxious to get back at Gompers and other "leaders." Socialist resolutions cannot hide these facts.

\* \* \* \*

Shall we ask the trade unions to indorse the Socialist Party?

No, decidedly no. We should never ask any union to indorse the Socialist Party. The American Labor Union convention indorsed the Socialist Party. Many Socialists throughout the country acted as if the Socialist Co-operative Commonwealth would be inaugurated in November, 1904, with headquarters somewhere in the Rocky Mountains. Since then we have had an election in Colorado. You know the result. The Frenchman would call it "*Un blamage pour le Socialisme!*"

As Socialist members of the trade union movement we must insist that the unions come down to the fundamental principles of the labor movement:

1. Labor creates all values.
2. Labor is entitled to all it creates.
3. Labor must devise ways and means to get into possession of its full products.

These questions must and will be discussed in the trade union movement. Neither Sam Gompers nor anyone else can prevent it. These are trade union questions. Socialism gives the solution to all of them. The very moment these points become clear in the minds of the union men we have gained our point. Socialism then becomes the philosophy of the union movement.

At the Boston convention of the A. F. of L. the Socialists did not ask for the indorsement of the Socialist Party. They asked for the discussion and indorsement of fundamental principles of the union movement and for the discussion and indorsement of ways and means to realize these principles. They did not ask the A. F. of L. convention to reorganize into a political party, but to remind the millions of union men throughout this country of their most sacred duty as wage workers and citizens and to co-operate politically on the same independent working class lines as pointed out by the Socialist Party.

St. Louis, March 19, 1904.

G. A. HOEHN.

---

### The May Convention.

I submit the following suggestions for the consideration of the delegates:

As every officer of the party is subject to removal by referendum, let the term of the members of the national committee be four years. Abolish the quorum. Let the members of the national committee select an executive committee of nine from its members. Vacancies to be filled by national committee. New member of executive committee not necessarily selected from state of preceding member.

Abolish the local quorum. It is useless and might become dangerous.

Increase salary of national secretary to twelve hundred dollars a year.

Abolish state autonomy. Highly centralized organic union is the spirit of social progress—of Socialism. Federation is liberalistic, anarchistic, capitalistic.

The headquarters shall be located at Indianapolis, Indiana, until changed by referendum.

The best control and regulation of Socialist agitators in the lecture field is the party press, and the rapidly increasing intelligence of the proletariat. Official interference, unless imperatively demanded, does not commend itself to me at present. These

conclusions are sustained by a very limited experience as lecturer and as listener. Other comrades' opinions and reasonings might cause me to change my present opinion.

Don't like the municipal committee idea. As our first power, and therefore first conflict with the established political order, will be municipal, I agree with Comrade Simons that our municipal policy is the largest immediate practical question that confronts us. I think our municipal policy should be included in our platforms, stated as broadly as will give it any meaning. I emphatically do not mean that it should contain any demands, immediate or remote, but a statement of the Socialist policy when it has obtained municipal powers.

Municipal plank suggested:

The Socialist party when in control of municipal government under capitalism, will give all municipal offices and positions to members of the party; and will increase the number of these offices and positions as rapidly and largely as possible. It will abolish the contract system; do its own exploiting directly; rigidly enforce the eight-hour law and pay the highest market wages. It will raise the largest possible revenue by the present and improved systems of taxation, and will expénd the same in such manner as may most largely and directly benefit the working class. It will acquire and develop all actual and potential "public utilities," and will sell their products at the cost of their production. All of these things can, as is well known, be lawfully done under the present system, and will be done whenever the working class elects Socialist municipal administrations.

No special resolution should be devoted to either the farmers or negroes. The farmers are not an economic class, but a technical industrial group. The negroes are not an economic, but an ethnic or racial group. The negro resolution adopted at Indianapolis should certainly be repealed. If any resolution on the negro question is ever to be adopted it should not be done until the subject has been fully explained and discussed by Socialists, for the purpose of discovering the right Socialist tactic. As is well known, this has never been done. A wrong tactic adopted now on this question may be so enormously detrimental to our cause that I pray you comrades let it await full and free discussion. Leave the question alone until we get to it.

I think the trade unions resolutions should be abolished and nothing further said on the subject by this convention. This conclusion is not only the result of the application of the scientific method to the subject, but is, I think, verified by the facts of our own experience. I am unalterably opposed to including the present or any other "immediate demands" in this or any other Socialist platform. The sufficient reasons for this conclusion will,

I am sure, be fully and ably presented by other comrades in these articles and on the floor of the convention.

The suggestion of the editor of this review, that we have an annual meeting of the members for the discussion of party policies, is heartily approved. The value of such meetings cannot be overestimated. I suggest next September as the time, Cincinnati as the place, and The First Annual Congress of the American Socialists as the name for the first meeting.

JOSEPH HORTON.

Nashville, Tenn.

---

### The Dues System.

**I**N my humble judgment the dues system of revenue should be eliminated from practice by Socialists.

We Socialists of Utah have been considerably worried and blocked in our work because of dues. The well-settled portions of the east naturally benefit from the national organization. The mountainous region of the west is one of magnificent distances and national organizers could not economically get along. So Socialism developed through local literature, agents and organizers. I believe the rapid increase of Socialism in the west is partly due to the greater intelligence, zeal and sacrifice of westerners who are familiar with campaigns over stage routes and mountain passes. Since the national organization cannot spend much money to advantage in the west, why should not the western comrades spend some money at home before sending dues east?

The dues system is conducive to a private snap for incapable officers of the party. Had the revenue instead been derived from voluntary contributions, the incapable officers would have quickly been forced to resign and better officers taken the places and quickly restored the good will of Socialists.

The dues system separates the propaganda movement from the party organization. When for any cause comrades have not funds enough to pay dues and till the local field at the same time they have to neglect one thing or the other. If they send too much dues away, they neglect the local propaganda work and the national organization is loser after all, because represented by a few members who fail to propagate in the locality.

The dues system makes it necessary to keep more books and to keep account with members in arrears. A voluntary system would be better.

The dues system is too expensive. It separates the family, since all persons added to membership from a family means an extra expense to the household.

When a local in an "unorganized state" pays ten cents national dues, the local dues can be no less than twenty-five cents, because supplies and hall rent are to be provided for. If in addition local propaganda has to be done from receipts of dues alone, it is clear that local dues must be fifty cents per month. How can all members of a family then attend as members of the party? How can a local keep the incapable in good standing?

It may be said that the dues system is all right, since it places control in the hands of experienced Socialists. This necessity is passing away, because of the greater than ever diffused knowledge of Socialistic principles. But, did we ever hear of beginners being anything but welcome in the party?

The dues system keeps the timid and loosely connected from holding membership. They might, if allowed to be members for a penny, gradually become more Socialistic, and, seeing the needs of the party, increase their support. Who shall judge if a good Socialist may not have good private reason for not financially supporting the movement one year or more? Sometimes a local is lapsed as a paying organization of the party. If such a local cannot afford to pay the full amount of dues, you might see them give a little less if voluntary, and something would be got out of it.

The advocates of dues system want to imitate trade unions. They ought to know that union and lodge membership is a luxury to many poor Socialists. Many Socialists hold lodge memberships and cannot double their outlays. The scope of the Socialist party is not so expensive and we do not want to compete in the field of those organizations.

I think most of the Socialists will do something when enlightened. Any person out of cash should look upon a dollar a month for the cause of labor's sinking fund as one of the necessities of life. When pay day comes labor's debt should be paid along with the grocery bills.

If the Socialist philosophy is not attractive as a voluntary proposition, a close corporation will not make it so. I think I am well within reasonable bounds when I say that nine-tenths of the propaganda for Socialism has been accomplished without a dues system, so that the extreme authoritarians have little indeed to boast of after all.

The greatest curse of a top-heavy movement is the loss of individuality. If nine-tenths of the money is spent locally, it means that local comrades get self culture. Reverse and give the biggest portion to national headquarters and you will see nothing but local nonentities. Surely we do not want to imitate the pure and simplers who send dues promptly, but have nothing of locally diffused intelligence to show for their money. Too bad for the vanity of the leaders that they cannot have all our

money and know the local needs some thousand miles away as well as local comrades! Too bad that they cannot "control" "the propaganda" which is growing over the heads of small intellectual barriers!

\* \* \*

Another close corporation method is the law of expulsion of members. It seems too bad. If a member cannot be controlled in the organization, how is he getting better on the outside. I suppose they cannot be chased off the earth, even if the party wins. Would it not be better, in case of individual inconsistency, that a committee issue a public proclamation to read something as follows: "Comrade Nonentity is a member of the Socialist organization and yet going astray by professing to believe Socialism and aiding Democrats and Republicans at the same time. The comrade mentioned is a candidate on the mixed ticket and you are hereby cautioned to vote for the straight Socialist candidate in opposition to fusion." Fraternally yours,

PETER JOHNSON.

Murray, Utah.

---

### Suggestions for Organization.

**I**N contributing my share to this symposium, I shall leave the questions of platform and party policy to other comrades and confine myself to suggestions concerning the government of the party organization.

The Socialist Party must be more than a mere political machine; it must be so managed and controlled that the highest degree of democracy consistent with efficiency as the directing force of Socialist activity must be attained. More and more we must provide for a decentralization of authority and the concentration of the forces of agitation and education. The national headquarters should be the nerve center of Socialist activity, the clearing house through which the different state organizations can be kept in close touch and sympathy with each other, thus ensuring an objective point at which the organized Socialist forces can converge and act unitedly.

The chief problem before us, then, as an organized body, is how to combine democracy in management, efficiency in action and economy in labor and expense so that the best and most permanent results can be attained.

The existing political system requires that state autonomy must necessarily continue to be the basis of organization, but its boundaries and limitations must be more definitely prescribed. There has been a tendency toward exclusiveness, to place the interests of a single state organization above those of the party

at large, a tendency as injurious as the other extreme of concentrating authority over the membership in a central committee. One carries state autonomy to the extreme and makes toward anarchy, the other denies democracy and makes toward absolutism. Both are dangerous and can only result in dry rot. Our national organization must be fluid enough to invite or encourage neither one nor the other.

Under the present constitution there is danger from both. The national officials may become aware, through the position they hold, that the officials of a state organization are, unknown to the membership, either neglecting their duties or perverting their powers to the injury of the party in that state or the entire country, and yet the national officers are powerless to act. Provision should be made for action in such cases, although such action should not be arbitrary or authoritative, but merely along the lines of suggestion, information or investigation, leaving final action to the membership of the state itself.

On the other hand, there is no constitutional preventive against the representatives or members of one state organization interfering with or usurping the duties and rights of other state organizations and their members. The activities of state officials should be confined to their own states, except where agreement is specifically made with other state organizations. The qualifications for obtaining and holding membership in all states should be made as uniform as possible, so that members should enjoy the same rights and privileges everywhere. A national party referendum could then be taken with more certainty that the will of the actual dues-paying membership would be expressed. A system of transferring membership from one state to another should also be adopted.

The basis of representation upon the National Committee, should that body be retained, must be set forth clearly and explicitly. The duties of the committee and the relation of the National Secretary to the committee should be more definitely outlined. The present method of transacting business is cumbersome and causes unnecessary work and friction. The relations of the National Secretary and the National Committee should be so adjusted that his work can be simplified and his time devoted mostly to the development and necessities of the organization. He should be chosen by referendum of the party membership, and not be responsible to a committee for his election. Certain qualifications should attach to the selection of national committeemen.

Precautions should be taken against the abuse or misuse of the referendum. The growth of the organization makes it necessary that the power to initiate should be restricted, and that propositions be limited in length. A law should be in force a given period before another law upon the same subject can be submitted to a referendum.

The present system of routing interstate lecturers and organizers loses its effectiveness through lack of definite agreement or understanding between the national headquarters and the various state organizations upon the method of arranging dates with locals. A uniform system should be agreed upon, which will permit of the best results at a minimum expenditure of labor, time and money.

It is essential that the membership be kept fully informed upon the actions of party officials and party affairs generally. The space in our press is too limited to admit of publishing all this information, which is of more or less importance. I believe the time has come when a monthly bulletin can be issued in printed form, this bulletin to be devoid of editorial matter and devoted entirely to financial, National Committee, organizers' and other reports, and the numerous details of party activity. This bulletin could be printed in quantities sufficient to reach every member.

With the further development and growth of the different state organizations there will gradually be less need of national organizers, but the present method of selecting these is not satisfactory. Certain qualifications should be required of applicants, such as length of party service, experience, knowledge of Socialism and details of organization, etc.

In order to avoid the recurrence of the danger of having state organizations formed where geographical or other conditions are unfavorable to their effective or permanent existence, the membership in any unorganized state should reach a certain number before the movement for a state organization be initiated.

Definite steps will have to be taken by the convention regarding the organization of the foreign-speaking workers into the party. The question whether these can be more effectively united into separate autonomous federations affiliated with the national organization, or into party locals and branches direct, will probably be presented, and as it is necessary that these workers be brought into line with the party this question may be one of the most important to be dealt with by the convention. We should be able to reach some agreement with the active foreign-speaking comrades by which their services can be utilized with satisfaction to themselves and benefit to the party organization.

WILLIAM MAILLY.

## Farmers and Socialism.

**F**OR the first time in the history of the American Socialist movement, its national convention will be fairly representative of the various elements which make up the exploited class of our population. Every state and territory in the union has now one or more locals paying dues to the national, state or territorial organizations. This will assure us a convention made up of delegates from shop, mine, office, factory and farm, and at least would seem to carry with it the assurance that our declaration of principles and purposes will be broad enough to cover the whole industrial class. It goes without saying that there will be differences of opinion, sharp antagonisms, discussions galore, and that out of it all will come a clearer statement of the position of the party on the questions which confront us. I do not care to discuss all of the propositions submitted, and will confine my opinion to one or two. Being a farmer, the attitude of the convention toward my wing of the industrial class appeals to me more strongly than anything else. I shall favor with earnestness such a definition of our position as will include the farmer in our program. He belongs to and is a part of the working class, but he is not a proletarian, and the word by no stretch of the imagination can be made to include him. We are not, however, dealing with dictionaries, but with capitalism, and the capitalist process includes the farmer in its list of victims, and has directed as much of its attention to his exploitation as to the strictly wage working class. The method is different, but the process is none the less complete.

On the broad ground of revolutionary principles, the conquest of political power by the working class through a political party built along class lines, with which to abolish the capitalist system and establish the co-operative commonwealth, we have a declaration sufficient to include the exploited of farm or factory. If we are to stop here, we need nothing more in the way of defining our attitude toward the trade unionist, the negro, or the farmer. Such a declaration is all inclusive, and in the early period of the movement nothing more was needed. We have, however, passed the first stage of our growth, and have reached the point where the utopian must come down out of the skies and the "predestination" Socialist face immediate details. We are beginning to capture municipalities, and this brings up the question of what may a Socialist administration do in a city or town whose citizens are limited in what they may or may not do by the state legislatures? Usually these governmental subdivisions are limited by charters, differing in the several states

and territories. Questions of municipal ownership of light, gas, water, abolition of the contract system, hours of labor, conduct of schools, taxation, etc., etc., confront a Socialist municipal administration, and in my judgment should not enter into or become a part of a National Socialist platform, but should be left to a municipal committee, whose function shall be to examine the laws of the different states and territories, determine what it is possible to do, and thus outline a working program for something like uniform action. When Socialist administrations assume control of cities and towns they become employers of labor, and here we touch the question of union and nonunion labor, what use we will make of police powers in strikes, with all of which we must deal. As we enter the southern field we meet the race question, and are thus compelled to define our attitude toward the negro. In like manner, as we invade the rural districts we are confronted with the "farmer question," and we are just as surely compelled to define ourselves here as with the other. I can add to the discussion on the subject only by giving my own personal views, which I submit. I hold that the farmer is being left in possession of the soil by the capitalist class because he can be more exploited as owner or occupant than as direct wage employe. Each farmer produces in competition with every other farmer, and the capitalist class are thus able to keep prices at the point where they return but a scant wage to the producer for his year's work. This reduction of the farmer to the wage basis is accomplished through the capitalist ownership of the machinery of finishing the production and distribution of the farmer's commodities. As a class the farmers can get no relief till this entire machinery is transferred from private to public operation, and as this machinery includes the railroads, packing houses, cotton and woolen mills, etc., etc., it follows that at the point where the wage workers want to take over this machinery to be publicly owned and democratically managed the farmer is equally interested, and the two interests unite. Now this applies to the farmers as a class, whether they be tenants or owners. All that I have written on this question has been along the line of endeavoring to interest the farmer in the struggle of the wage worker, assuring him that only through the emancipation of the wage worker can he—the farmer—hope for any relief whatever. The rural population may be divided into wage workers (farm hands), tenants, mortgaged farmers and farm owners, large and small. I doubt if there will ever be an industrial organization of farm hands, for their ranks are thinning. Rent is the most popular and profitable means of exploitation on the farm, and it is possible, I believe probable, that the tenants will ultimately organize against landlordism, for the latter is increasing rapidly. The present tendency of landlordism is not toward enlarging the unit of the farm, but toward subdivi-

vision. When the industrial struggle of the tenant comes against the landlord master, and it will soon be here, we will find material for the rural local in abundance. Again, however, must the poor tenant wait for state and national success of the Socialist party before his condition can be relieved, and it is very doubtful if any relief can be reached short of the complete overthrow of capitalism. With Socialist success in a township or county will come the administration of public work, but it is of small importance. With success in capturing a state will come some benefit, through public ownership of telephones, electric railroads and similar utilities, but again these things belong with the states, and ought not to be placed in a national declaration. In my judgment all that the National Convention ought to do on the farmer question is to include the farmer in the definition of the working class, and that is all we farmers will at present ask. We certainly do not want a farmer's program for national action, for we have none to offer. Just hang out the "latch string" to us, make us welcome, and we will be content to rally round the proletarian standard.

A. W. RICKER.

---

### Times Bring Change.

**T**IMES bring change. This startling and sage thought occurs to me whenever I think of the recent mutations in the ideas about social uniformity and variety.

There was a time, and that not very long ago, when it was a common belief among the Socialists that the real struggle between capitalism and Socialism will be for the control of the powers of the state vested in the federal government. And since we, Socialists, never doubt that victory will be ours and that we will finally capture the federal government, it was to our strategical advantage to localize and centralize the powers of state in the federal government to the highest degree. Added to this may be the theory which persists at this day among Socialists that higher social organization means more uniformity and centralization. For this reason we took at a discount mere state offices and viewed with contemptuous condescension the municipal functions and emoluments. The pretensions to sovereignty of the state and even the home rule aspirations of the municipalities were scouted as sentimental and reactionary. Were the powers of government to be stored away in all sorts of out of the way, obscure corners of the land, where we would have to search for them with compass and candle? The idea of scattering the governmental functions all over the country among the vast number of microscopic corporate bodies made us shrug our shoulders with impatience. Were we expected to currycomb the country for the pitiable dribbles of state power vested in capitalistic

village, towns and burgs? Our own plan of rounding up the whole job lot of the powers of government in one big, federal heap was, certainly, the more scientific and in keeping with our theories; at least we thought so.

But the very first lessons in practical politics made the Socialists veer and tack. It is now safe to conclude that the Socialists will face about on this point. We are now agreed that the control of the federal government is a much more remote possibility for the Socialists than the control of a state or some municipalities. The Socialists may shortly capture many a municipality and even some states. But the capitalists, entrenched in the federal government, will continually make inroads into the powers secured by the Socialists. No doubt, as the municipalities will, one after another, come under the control of the Socialists, the state governments will curtail their powers and functions, and as the state governments will fall into the hands of the Socialists, the federal government will arrogate to itself many of the powers which are now considered as peculiarly within the province of the state governments. Hence it may be safely assumed that the Socialist party will be compelled by the force of events to become a party of state rights and home rule. The tendency to augment the powers of the state government to the detriment of the municipality and of the federal government to the abridgment of the state rights is very pronounced even now. The functions of the New York Board of Aldermen is rapidly being reduced to issuing boot-blacking and fruit stand licenses. An assmbyman from the backwoods seated in Albany has more to say about the administration of the affairs of New York city than an alderman especially elected to look after these affairs. It is everywhere likewise, in a greater or smaller degree. They are agitating now for the enactment of a national corporation law, national insurance law, national divorce law and so on. They argue that what the country needs now is uniformity in its legislation. This after having poured out vials of wrath on the poor Socialists for the alleged Socialist plan of introducing everywhere uniform social regulation. There were not a few Socialist-killers who argued themselves into the belief that uniformity of social regulations is a peculiarly Socialist doctrine and thereupon discovered that variety is the spice of life and the very breath in the nostrils of civilization. The Socialists were roundly denounced by these variety-mongers as so many barbarians, who would attempt to cut all things after one pattern.

There were also quite a number of Socialists who accepted uniformity as a Socialist doctrine, but argued that uniformity is the essence of social harmony.

Now we are going to change places on this question with our friends, the capitalists, as they do in a game of preference.

The capitalists are ever oftener discovering that the variety in the municipal enactments and state laws results in anarchy. Let times bring change. Variety, once the necessary ingredient of social progress, means now anarchy. The capitalists will not permit anarchy to grow rampant. Hence uniformity of social regulations and centralization of legislation will ensue. The Socialists, in virtue of their political position, will offer stubborn resistance to this regimentation of society. To a superficial observer the position may appear anomalous. But it is only as it should be. Dying social forms must grow rigid and petrified. The new social forms will be as changeable, protean and all-containing as is nature itself.

HENRY L. SLOBODIN.

---

## Two Programs.

**T**WO reports should be made to the convention from the two committees created by the Indianapolis convention, one on a municipal program, the other on a farmers' program.

The delegates should consider both propositions as much as possible before the convention is called to order, for the reports of the committee will only serve as a basis to start the discussion of the respective subjects.

The proletarian character of the American cities, although with very limited authority, furnish an opportunity for a constructive program, vast, far-reaching and comprehensive.

In line with economic evolution, the political conquest of the working class will first take place within the cities. A third of the nation's population are now in towns of over 8,000 inhabitants, and by 1920 there will be (with the present increase) over 10,000,000 more population in the cities than in the country. The rapid increase of the Socialist vote throughout the country at any moment may place us in possession of cities of more than minor importance, with all the grave responsibilities which that would entail. The first administrations of Socialists will contribute greatly to retard or enhance the party strength and therefore are of extreme importance. We may analyze capitalism, academically declare what we propose, but to constructively assume a tangible, practical position is quite a different thing, and that such a constructive policy may receive the full and intelligent support of the party membership, necessitates agitation along lines comparatively new.

The impossibility of the immediate transformation of the small privately owned farms into government property operated upon a vast well-organized scale is pretty well recognized by all comrades. Intermediate to our ultimate aim the Socialists should

take a position which will assist the farmer proletariat (small landholder), free him from the warehouse, grain elevator and packing-house exploiters, and a program should be adopted applicable to the necessities of farmers, not as a sop, but as an essential step or method leading by the most direct route to complete collectivism.

In my judgment, these are the two great problems of our party today, and a proper solution will result in a cohesive constructive tendency in the Socialist Party and movement in America.

SEYMOUR STEDMAN.

---

### No Official National Organizers Wanted.

AS TO the matter of municipal programs, it seems to me from what I find in various parts of the country that the party should give some very careful attention to this matter. In many places I find the comrades puzzling over this matter, not knowing what to do; some perplexed by the thought that we cannot do anything. As has been clearly shown by the Socialists in European municipalities, there are many things we can do. The work of the committee appointed by the Indianapolis convention on suggested lines of municipal activity should be continued. Their report should be revised carefully and sent out again. Some such pamphlet as "Socialists in French Municipalities," which might be revised and improved, should be widely distributed as a matter of instruction to our comrades who are eager to learn on these lines.

I do not think that there should be any effort to force the municipal programs into uniformity. But I do feel that we must go before the people of the cities with an intelligent working program. A mere jumble of phrases, dealing in generalities and susceptible of various and ambiguous interpretations, will not suffice. We must be able to present some kind of a reasonable and definite working program.

(2) As to Socialist speakers, it seems to me that we should give them the utmost freedom possible. I think the way to control them is simply not to engage them if they don't talk Socialism. And I cannot see the need of anything more than that. Official censorship and unofficial heresy hunting will only make trouble.

The official endorsement, and official pay of official organizers, and the accumulation of a fund in the hands of the central office, as we have it now, are almost certain to lead to dissatisfaction, possibly to favoritism, or the suspicion of it. These are, perhaps, necessary evils, but it has occurred to me that they might be minimized by turning more of the work over to the

state committees, and giving the states a larger proportion of the dues they raise to be expended in their own state.

(3) As to our attitude towards farmers, I do not see that anything more is needed or desirable in the propaganda work among the agricultural workers, or small farmers, than a reasonable interpretation of scientific Socialism. If there is need of something to make a reasonable interpretation more general some resolution expressing our view of the application of the privilege of economic determinism in making the interests of the small farmers more and more parallel with those of the wage-earners should be passed. The greatest value of such a resolution, perhaps, would be in clearing the minds of our workers on the matter. I certainly would not favor any modification of our program for the sake of attracting farmers. And what is more, I don't see that it is needed.

CARL D. THOMPSON.

---

### Election of Socialists Not Desired at Present.

**W**HAT changes do you think are necessary in the party organization?

Practically none. The forms of organization count little. If the spirit of Socialism is present, the mere forms will adapt themselves to the needs of the growing body. As we need changes, they will be demanded and made. The great thing now is to educate the wage workers, create in them an intelligent class consciousness, awake them to action and then organization will follow.

One point in general as to organization: Whatever changes are made should be in the direction of democracy and against all centralization of power. We are not only Socialists, but democratic Socialists.

For this reason, a central party organ would be dangerous, placing prestige and undue influence in the National Committee or National Board of Control.

For this reason, also, changes are to be commended which will safeguard Referendum votes, and explicitly define the methods of taking same. Too often now a central committee is able to manipulate the party will as expressed in the Referendums. The Socialist Party is introducing the Referendum. It should introduce it right.

What, if any, action should be taken towards setting forth a working program for such members as may be elected to office within a capitalist government? Should such a program be attached to the platform, embodied in a separate and explanatory document, or entirely omitted?

We are not in immediate danger of electing such officials, except in municipalities. In any case, it is more important that such officials be well grounded in the fundamental principles of Socialist economics than that they be supplied with a Procrustean bed of proper things to do, called a "working program."

"Whatever is to the interest of the working class, that I will do," is the one pledge of every Socialist nominee. If he is not intelligent enough to decide for himself what is to the interest of his class in any given conditions, he is not fit to be a Socialist nominee.

In my judgment, it is better that we do not win elections, even in municipalities, for some years to come. The majority of our membership are so raw in the Socialist army and so soaked with capitalist notions of politics and economics, that it will be better for us to pass through several campaigns of *education* before we win political campaigns. In fact, our political campaigns have their chief function for the present as *means of education*.

*Have you any suggestion as to the methods of controlling those who represent the Socialist Party on the public platform?*

Control them by controlling the *selection* of them. After a speaker is selected, he must be given freedom of expression. Here, again, it is all important that the fundamentals be understood. If a man is educated in the principles of scientific Socialism, his utterances will need no control. If he is not, no methods will control him. He is a ship without a rudder.

I can suggest no better way of selecting speakers than the present. Local and state committees must decide according to their best judgment. They will make mistakes and correct them. The final test will be the educated instinct of the comrade, which will not long tolerate any serious departure from proletarian principles.

*What action, if any, should be taken towards securing uniformity of action by Socialists elected to municipal positions?*

Let our Municipal Committee's report be published, embracing a full discussion of this matter. This will serve as a helpful stimulus to such officials toward reaching Socialist decisions on all pending questions. But no "Rules and Regulations" for a Socialist legislator or executive when occupying a capitalist office! If the comrades are so deficient in judgment as to select and elect a "chump," they and the party ought to be punished by his blunders, and so learn better.

*Should there be any special expression of our attitude towards the farmers or negroes? If so, what?*

Yes, something as follows:

*Resolved*, That the negro wage slave is robbed of the greater part of his product, the same as the white wage slave, and the Socialist Party is his only hope of emancipation. We therefore

welcome the negro vote as we do the vote of all wage slaves, without respect to color, sex or nationality, and we advocate active propaganda and organization among the negro population of the United States.

#### FARMER RESOLUTION.

*Resolved*, That the small farmer has no hope of deliverance from his present hard conditions except by uniting with the wage workers' political organization, the Socialist Party. The small farmer must recognize that the United States is no longer an agricultural but a manufacturing country, and that therefore the dominant, typical class is the class of wage workers, the one class that must save society. We call upon the small farmers to look beyond their own class, to recognize the supreme class struggle between capital and wage labor and to join hands with that class which alone can bring freedom from all economical bondage.

*Should the present "trade union resolution" stand? If not, how should it be changed?*

Yes, with an additional resolution, somewhat like this:

*Resolved*, That the trade unions at this moment stand at the parting of the ways. The capitalist class is making supreme efforts to capture them by spies and hired leaders, by flattery and negotiations, by insisting on the common interests of labor and capital, by alarmist appeals against Socialism and Socialist agitators.

On the other hand, the strategic moment has arrived for the Socialists to outmaneuver these capitalist tactics by making the most strenuous efforts to educate the trades unions in Socialist economics. We therefore reiterate our former resolution and call upon all comrades to join their respective unions with a view to saving them from capitalist control.

We urge our comrades to point out three things to their trades union brothers. (1) That the great combinations of capital in vast industries, embracing many trades, make it impossible for mere trade organizations to succeed as formerly and render it necessary for unions to be organized along industrial rather than trade lines. (2) That the growing power of concentrated capital renders even the best organized labor unions more and more impotent and must make it evident that only by united action on the political field can labor achieve any permanent benefit for itself. (3) That nothing short of the Socialist program, abolishing the wage system itself, will be of any use as a political demand.

HERMON F. TITUS,

Editor *The Socialist*, Seattle, Wash.

## More Socialism in the Platform, More Democracy in the Constitution.

**I**N reply to the invitation of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, I take the liberty to state my personal views on some matters of importance for our national convention.

### PARTY ORGANIZATION.

The present plural vote of the national committeemen is as unfair as was the old system of one vote for each national committeeman regardless of the number of party members he represented. Under the old system, fifteen party members in Oklahoma had as much influence in the national committee as fifteen hundred party members in New York. The present plural vote remedies this defect. But it at the same time introduces a new defect which is fully as bad. In the old system, the minority did not count at all. In the new plural system, the minority vote is included in the representation of the states, but it is cast against the minority. Take it, for instance, that Illinois is entitled to fourteen votes in the national committee. All these fourteen votes are cast solidly for the wishes of the majority who elected the national committeeman; or, if he is not instructed by the majority, he votes on the question under consideration from his own point of view. In either case, he uses the votes of a certain number of party members contrary to their wishes. This is a gross injustice and must be remedied without delay.

One way out of this difficulty would be to elect two national committee members from each state entitled to more than one vote, one to be elected by the opportunist element, the other by the revolutionary element, and each to have in the national committee a number of votes proportional to the number of party members who elected them. I mention these two factions, because nearly all questions of party policy are approached from these two standpoints, and they would furnish the simplest and most permanent line of division. States that are only entitled to one vote in the national committee could not make use of this expedient, however. There would also be the difficulty of leaving still other elements unrepresented that belong neither to the opportunist nor to the Marxian element, as, for instance, the impossibilist element.

Another way out of the difficulty would be to abolish the national committee and national quorum entirely. Personally, I very much prefer this alternative. In my opinion, these two bodies have been more ornamental than useful, and their expenses might have been used to good effect in other work. All

important questions must be settled by referendum, anyway, and for ordinary routine work, the national secretary and the state committees form a sufficient and far more representative organization. Let us dispense with all superfluous wheels in our party machinery. The simpler it is, the better it will express the will of the rank and file. Let the state committees assume the duties of their national committeeman. Let the national secretary publish his quarterly reports. And let a national convention perform the services of the national quorum and at the same time assign definite subjects to certain comrades, for discussion at such conventions, and we shall accomplish for better results at less cost to the national office than we do with the present form of organization.

#### PLATFORM.

I am in favor of a scientifically correct, yet clear and concise declaration of principles in place of the present platform. My reasons for this position I have stated in detail in the pamphlet "The Municipality from Capitalism to Socialism" and in the article "Shall We Revise Our Program Forward or Backward?" in the December, 1903, issue of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW. No immediate demands, no special resolutions for trade unions, farmers, negroes, etc. The text of this declaration of principles can be so worded that it will fully cover those classes and emphasize the fact that the Socialist Party seeks to develop the political class struggle in the interest of all proletarians regardless of race, color, creed and occupation, whether organized or unorganized, whether in the store, the shop, the factory, the mine, the field, the office, the school, or the pulpit. It should be urged on the state organizations to make this declaration of principles their platform also in state and municipal campaigns, in place of the great variety of present platforms, many of them fearfully and wonderfully made. And if the next international congress should agree on a uniform international Socialist platform, I am in favor of adopting that platform in all campaigns, whether national, state, or municipal.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR ACTIVITY OF SOCIALISTS FOR PUBLIC OFFICES.

A handbook for Socialists in public offices, making detailed suggestions for uniformity of action under the capitalist system, is indispensable. Each state might appoint a committee for drawing up an outline for the work of Socialists in state and municipal offices, and the national convention appoint a committee to draft suggestions for Socialist activity in Congress. The committee elected by the national convention might at the same time act as editor and compiler of the suggestions made by the states. This handbook would form the basis of our present-

day activity in office, be a guide for speakers, and serve as a propaganda booklet. With the increasing experience of our successful candidates, the contents of this booklet would be augmented by the bills introduced by us and by summaries of the results obtained in the various public bodies.

#### PRESS BUREAU.

I favor relieving the national secretary of the burden of press bulletins and press reports. This work can be done to great advantage by a Socialist press bureau in charge of a competent editor. This bureau should receive copies of all correspondence passing between the national secretary and the national committee and quorum; or, if these are abolished, between the national secretary and the state committees. This correspondence should be summarized by the editor of the press bureau for publication in the Socialist press. The press bureau should also collect material for an official history of the American Socialist party, and become the nucleus for such official publications as the party may wish to issue from time to time. Finally, this press bureau might furnish suitable editorial matter and patent insides to the small local papers which the comrades in all parts of the country may succeed in enlisting on our side. This bureau, if properly managed, should be able to pay for itself in the course of a few years. Last, not least, this press bureau should accumulate a party library and archive in connection with the collection of material for a party history. Twenty-five cents from each dues-paying party member will set this bureau on its feet.

Incidentally, I take this opportunity to remark, that a permanent Socialist daily is a pressing necessity for the American Socialist movement. This should be a regular newspaper, similar to the metropolitan dailies, and edited from the Socialist point of view, with a department for party news and a page on scientific Socialism. This daily should find its way into every Socialist home in the United States and form one of the strongest propaganda means at our command. It would not have any official character, but be supported by the individual members, who should furnish the first means for its publication and form a stock company for this purpose. If each of the present dues-paying members of the party would at once devote \$2, or as much as he or she can spare, to this purpose, the first number of this daily could be circulated at the coming national convention.

#### THE CONTROL OF SPEAKERS.

So long as the principle of state and local autonomy is recognized, the party has no means of preventing any local from engaging any free lance speaker they may like. But the national secretary might issue speakers' cards to those who place them-

selves under the control of the national or state organizations, and make it known that only those are authorized to speak in the name of the party who carry such a card. This would enable the party to decline all responsibility for statements on Socialism made by free lance speakers. Each state committee might act as a board of examination for applicants for speaker's cards.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

---

### An Official Guide for Candidates Needed.

**Q**UESTION NO. 1—The party organization seems to work harmoniously on the whole, and perhaps should not be interfered with. The only thing I can suggest is that the machinery should be simplified wherever possible. In this respect I would suggest that the body known as the National Quorum should be investigated for the purpose of seeing whether it cannot be dispensed with. It seems to me that the National Committee and the National Secretary are in no particular need of such an intermediary. I confess that I am by no means an expert on organization, and only suggest this for the reason that I can see no particular use for this body, though I readily admit that I may be mistaken.

No. 2—By all means detach all "immediate demands," municipal programs, working programs, etc., from the National Platform. They do not belong there and are a source of constant confusion. A guide or manual for the direction of candidates that may be elected, should be issued under the auspices of the Party in pamphlet form. It should be very carefully prepared by the best intellects in the party and submitted to the membership. It would be well also to set forth that it is subject to change from time to time to suit new conditions; that it is in no sense to be considered as binding as the platform, but more in the nature of a general guide. It would be manifestly impossible to cover every point and provide a course of action for every case, where local and municipal conditions differ, and the knowledge of Socialism possessed by the various candidates diverges widely. But this does not hinder the Party from issuing a statement in general terms showing its position on these questions.

No. 3—For National Lecturers, a Board of Examiners composed of membership of National Committee. For local speakers a similar board composed of the City Central Committee in places where there are more than one local. In single locals, the local itself. The examination should cover the fundamental principles of Socialism as an imperative qualification of the applicant, who should also be required to show his abil-

ity to avoid the most general blunders of novices on the street rostrum. For the position of a National Lecturer, the test of course should be more thorough and more detailed. Speakers who merely "introduce the speaker" may be exempt.

No. 4—Same as No. 2. On general grounds I should say that uniformity in this respect can never be wholly attained, but every effort should be made to secure as much of it as is possible. We may, I think, make up our minds to a constant though diminishing friction on this point.

No. 5—The Negro Resolution should stand. The position of the party towards the farmer should most certainly be explained and publicly stated. It is of great importance at the present juncture. It should be drafted by a committee carefully selected for knowledge of agricultural economics and clear conception of the trend of capitalist development and social evolution, and then submitted to the membership. The method of the exploitation of the farmer through the ownership of the predominant means of production necessary in farming, in the hands of the capitalist class, should be succinctly stated, as a central feature of the resolution. The various consequences arising from this should be mentioned, the whole leading up to the identity of interests between the farmer and wage worker. It will be difficult to boil this down into the compass of a resolution, but it should be attempted, and revised or improved from time to time as the party knowledge increases.

No. 6—The "Trades Union Resolution" needs some small changes in the wording. Cut out the fulsome adjective regarding the waging of the class struggle. We have no need to make a virtue out of a necessity. In the clause, "We recognize that trades unions are by historical necessity," etc., substitute "were" for "are." It could easily be contended that such historical necessity is not altogether applicable to all unions that are being now organized. If such historical necessity holds good today, it makes ridiculous the statement that follows "that it is the duty of every trades unionist to realize" another "necessity," that of "independent political action on Socialist lines.

Jos. WANHOPE.

## A Proposed Platform.

**T**HE Socialist Party, in National Convention assembled, reaffirms its adherence to the principles of International Socialism, and declares its aim to be the organization of the working class, and those in sympathy with it, into a political party, with the object of conquering the powers of government and using them to inaugurate the Co-Operative Commonwealth, under which the workers will receive the full product of their toil.

The most important principles embraced in the program of International Socialism are:

1. The public ownership of all the means of producing and distributing wealth.
2. The democratic control of the same by means of the initiative and referendum, proportional representation, and the right of recall of representatives by their constituents; and,
3. Equal civil and political rights for men and women.

As the Co-Operative Commonwealth cannot be established in a day, the Socialist Party, on coming into power, will immediately take the following steps, which will finally lead to its complete establishment:

1. All monopolies, trusts and combines, as well as all other institutions conducted for the personal gain of the owner instead of for the common good, will be taxed and the funds thus obtained will be used in establishing a system of public industries which will be the starting point of the great "Public Trust," which will drive private business to the wall in the same way and by somewhat the same means as the trust is driving the small business man to the wall.

2. State and national insurance for the working people in case of disability or non-employment will be established, to prevent them from suffering during the reconstruction period.

3. State and municipal aid will be given in the education of all children up to the age of eighteen years, as the Socialist Party realizes that the strength of any nation depends on the education and general character of its citizens.

In bringing this condition of affairs to pass, the Socialist Party will establish economic equality, by abolishing the economic classes, and in abolishing classes will bring to an end the terrible class struggle with all its sufferings and starvation of the workers, as well as the inconvenience to the consumers.

To me it seems that a platform on the style of the above should be adopted and that a manifesto, explaining it very briefly, should be printed with the platform.

This manifesto should explain how machinery has taken the place of the hand tools and how it is used to the detriment of the worker. It should point out to the farmer how he, as well as the wage-earner, is exploited of the fruits of his labor. It should point out to the negro that the race question will be settled only when the class war is ended, and it should point out to the unions that, though they benefit the working class to a great extent, they can never expect to lead them to freedom by economic means alone.

This would leave the platform in a simple state and at the same time the people would be given an idea of how we stand, thus accomplishing what we wish. Fraternally,

Chico, Cal.

H. B. WEAVER.

### Convention Work.

**W**E ARE probably facing a break-up in the old parties. The Populist Party is disorganized and the Democratic Party seems to be in the throes of dissolution. Some think Roosevelt will split the Republican Party.

In any event, the time is approaching when a multitude of American voters, rebellious at existing economic conditions, and despairing of old parties, will be seeking new political alignment. Many of these will investigate the claims of the Socialist Party.

#### THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

These voters will be told that the Socialist movement rests upon the class struggle. The nature of the struggle must then be explained to them. Who are struggling and why?

The opinion exists widely that the under dog in this struggle is the wage earner exclusively, and that the Socialist movement is purely a wage earner's movement. A vast army, however, of those already discontented and those rapidly becoming so are not wage earners; they are tenants, small farmers, small business men and tradesmen, commercial travelers, professional men, etc.

All of these are exploited. Their compensation is a subsistence or little more and their children are candidates for jobs.

The normal political home of all these is the Socialist Party whose "aim is to organize the working class and those in sympathy with it into a political party with the object of conquering the powers of government."

The Socialist Party, at its coming national convention, should make it transparently clear that, regardless of subordinate economic struggles between groups of the exploited

class—farmers and their hands, corner grocers and their clerks, even husbands and their wives—the class struggle is that between the myriad, white, black, yellow or red, who do the world's work, of hand or brain, in overalls or store clothes, in furrow, shop, counting room or wherever; and the handful who intercept the fruits and accumulate the fortunes. The Socialist Party should leave no room for doubt that it wants the whole of the exploited producing class and not a mere section of it.

#### TERMINOLOGY.

Second, as to terminology. Our debt of gratitude to the mighty warriors for freedom who have battled for Socialism on European soil can never be paid; but, were they with us, they would be the first to tell us that Americans must be reached through American channels. European phrases and modes of expression should be cut out of the vocabulary of American Socialism as relentlessly as Greek, Italian, and other foreign phrases were cut out of the English Department of Harvard University half a generation ago. Unless it would sign its own death warrant, Socialism in America must not even remotely suggest that it is an importation. Americans are proudly self-sufficient, and they will consciously borrow their politics from no foreign people on earth.

#### “SOCIALISTIC SLAVERY.”

Third, as to “phalansteries,” “bureaucracies,” “industrial armies,” “regimentation,” etc.

The writer was kept out of the Socialist movement for years, and that after having waded through shoals of literature, because he believed that under Socialism every competent worker would be obliged to work for the public. Let us make it plain that we contemplate nothing of the sort. The producers must control, exploitation must end, toil must be rewarded, idleness punished and involuntary poverty abolished; the millionaire scum at the top and the tramp dregs at the bottom of the social sea must disappear; but individual liberty and initiative, so long as they avoid forms socially or individually hurtful, will be enlarged rather than diminished under Socialism. The extent to which Collectivism is to be carried will be determined by the voters as we go along, and the individual's option to work for the public or in some other way will be guaranteed.

#### THE LAND QUESTION.

Fourth, as to land. Do Socialists want all the land, city and country, agricultural and mineral, plain and mountain

forest and grazing, business sites and residence sites, to be publicly owned and administered? If so, when do they expect to see this program carried out?

Yet land must not be used for purposes of exploitation.

The solution is simple. All land the public want they will take over as fast as they want it. Land left, meanwhile, in private hands will be subjected to the ground-rent tax. That gives the public time to consider the complexities of the land question, but stops the stealing on every square inch, from ocean to ocean, from lakes to gulf and throughout the isles of the sea.

#### THE MONEY QUESTION.

Fifth, Socialist silence on the money question must be broken if the Socialists are to control America. Let us take the bull by the horns and do it now. We must have a medium of exchange. It must be divested of all exploitative features and it must do the work. Finally, it should harmonize with Socialist philosophy. We do not believe in making new systems. We believe in taking the systems which evolution has made ready to our hands and adapting them to our social needs.

The national banking system gives us the machinery almost complete. The coming central bank and branch banks will round it out. This system we must take over as we expect to take over the other permanent trusts; and we must utilize it for the public good rather than private profit. The volume of exchange medium we will regulate to meet the needs of society.

Whether we believe in bank notes, greenbacks or labor checks, all the essential requirements of either system are in this way met.

#### STEPS TOWARD THE GOAL.

Sixth and finally, how shall we attain Socialism? On this point there seems to exist much crudity of thought. Some Socialists seem still to scout political action; others, nominally accepting it, fight every practical political proposal. Can it be that the anarchism which Marx combated in Europe still lurks in the Socialist Party of America?

Are we agreed on a few fundamentals?

Socialism must be established by political action.

It cannot be established in spots; it must be universal or non-existent.

Yet some communities may be far in advance of others: New Zealand, e. g., distancing Turkey.

Socialism can be established nowhere until the producing classes secure control.

Nor can it be established then until they understand what to do and how to do it.

In establishing Socialism in the U. S. national measures must be enacted in the Nation, state measures by the state and municipal measures by the municipality.

Little can be done by the Nation till the producers control House, Senate, Presidency and Supreme Court.

The producers cannot control the Senate until they first control a considerable group of states.

But when the Socialists carry a state the Socialist movement in America will face a crisis. The Socialists may fail to improve their opportunity. If so, they will discredit the movement throughout the country and, perhaps, retard it many years; or they may rise to the occasion and thus give to the movement a mighty impulse.

The American state is autonomous. In purely state affairs it is theoretically, and, in large measure, actually, as independent as is France or Holland.

An American State under Socialist control could go far toward establishing the co-operative commonwealth within its borders. It could put into practical effect almost all of the "immediate demands" of our national platform. In Kansas, e. g., it could establish popular government, including initiative, referendum, recall, woman suffrage and home rule for cities; provide employment, at trade union hours, wages and conditions, for its own unemployed if not for others; establish public industries and utilities, including electric car lines, telephones, coal mines, oil wells and refineries, gas wells, salt wells, and agriculture under the direction of its agricultural college and experiment station, selling the products to its own people at cost; it could enact and enforce income, inheritance, corporation and land-values taxation, insure its working people against lack of employment, sickness and want in old age, and provide a complete educational ladder for all its children from kindergarten to doctorate without a penny of charge to the individual.

Socialists would thus make a Socialist administration so popular as to insure its continuance and thus, in time, make the state a Mecca for the exploited of all other states whom it saw fit to admit. These other states, to hold their populations, would be driven to follow the example of Kansas. This, in a few years, would insure to the Socialists the U. S. Senate. Then when we secured the Presidency we would also have both houses of Congress. Next, by a law reorganizing the U. S. Supreme Court, we would obtain control of that body. Then, without stopping for "immediate demands," we could proceed to establish Socialism on a national scale. Finally,

as Kansas by doing its duty became a Mecca for the exploited of the U. S., the U. S. itself, would, in turn, become a promised land for the exploited of the world and thus force the world to follow its example.

Here we have, in rough outline, the path to international Socialism, and every step in line with American tradition and constitutional habit. Can we agree on this program? If not, can some one suggest a better one?

THOMAS ELMER WILL.

*President, American Socialist College; Secretary, Socialist Party of Kansas.*

---

### A Short Platform Wanted.

**Y**OURS of February 22nd at hand and would say that in my opinion our platforms are much too long and go into far too many details. If I were drawing up a platform I would probably limit it to a declaration of a general demand for the co-operative commonwealth.

Our conventions waste hours of time over minor points in drawing up a platform and ten minutes after it adjourns everybody forgets all about the whole matter until we meet again at the convention the following year. As to a working program for such members as may be elected to office within the Capitalist government, I would say that the drawing up of any such program is so very difficult as it must meet different cases in different places that I would advise nothing of the sort be done. For instance, as a general proposition we would say that no franchise for a street railroad should be given to any private corporation, but that it should be held by the city and that any railroad to be built should be operated and owned by the city.

In some places this might be modified to suit public sentiment by allowing franchises to be given where the rate of fare would be fixed at three cents and the hours of labor at eight and the wages of employees at \$3.00 a day. Such a compromise to certain Socialists would be a most traitorous act and to others would be the height of wisdom. In some western cities where the population is scarce and where a town might not be able to build a railroad at all, yet there is a great demand from all classes for such a railroad, if a Socialist in office should oppose the giving away of the franchise or even of the imposing of any such restrictions as indicated above which would prevent the building of the railroad, he would be denounced by every one as an enemy of the community, so I say it is hard in a Capitalist world which is full of contradictions for an elected Socialist to follow any course laid down

by the Socialist convention which will adequately meet every situation.

It is well known that I am not in any sense an opportunist in the sense that I would favor measures which tend to gradually bring in Socialism, but I am decidedly an opportunist when it comes to making propaganda. I do not believe in Socialists doing anything which so ostracises them from the community in which they live that they are not able to get an audience. I believe that we should have Socialism at once and I think we can and will have it in a comparatively short time. I think the great mission of the Socialist is to get before the public and let them know what we want and why we are going to get it. Everything which prevents the Socialist getting the ear of the public is so much the worse for Socialism.

I should say nothing at all as to the farmer. It is too complicated a problem. I think the farmer, when the next depression in agriculture comes, is going to be very ripe for our propaganda as he will be ripe on revolutionary lines and not on opportunist lines.

As for the negro, I think the less slush and slop we Socialists indulge in about our red, white, black and yellow brothers the better. Faithfully yours.

GAYLORD WILSHIRE.

---

## Some General Suggestions.

### AN EX-SLAVE HOLDER ON THE NEGRO QUESTION.

In fulfillment of a duty which I feel I owe to the colored race, the Socialist Party, Comrade Debs and Comrade Untermann, I add my hearty approval to their articles as given in the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW. To me it seems that Comrade Untermann's suggestion as to a universal socialist programme will prove the life of our party and will greatly facilitate our action.

As to Debs, he voices my sentiment on the negro question verbatim, and I have reason to believe that he has extracted the Tom Dixon rot from the head of the "staunch socialist."

I speak from my own knowledge of our negroes. I was born inside of the same enclosed yard that they were born in, nursed and cared for by the older ones while a helpless kid; fought and scratched with them as we grew up, until the law of man (not God's, as I was taught) made me their cruel master. Then I proved cruel, and I beat them without cause, believing I was their superior. But time proved, to their eternal credit, and to my eternal disgrace, and to the eternal shame of my race, that the negro was our superior.

Now for facts as I know them. - I left a colored woman with my wife to protect and care for her at a time when this section was alternately occupied by one army and then the other. This woman, on being told that some white women had been insulted by a soldier—this very negro woman—went to my wife with a huge butcher knife in her hand, saying to her: "Miss Samantha, if any man dares to insult you while Marse Jo is gone, I'll be durned if I don't wash my hands in his blood; I don't care

a durn whether he be Reb or Yank." Show me, if you can, such devotion among the white race. Mark you, I was then away from home fighting to keep her and her race in this miserable state of bondage.

Again, in the year 1863, my brother and I were fed by a man that our father had raised and on whose back we had placed stripes. This very man, Jerry, risked being punished to bring to us in camp food such as we had been strangers to since we had left our homes. Think of this, all you nigger haters! Jerry paid us in kindness for our cruelty.

Again, do you not know that during the war, if the negroes had been what you suppose and as mean as I acknowledge I was at that time, they would have taken advantage of our absence and could have massacred every woman, child and aged man in the thirteen southern states. All, all was at their mercy. Did they seek retaliation? No. But to my certain knowledge they continued to protect and care for the mistress and little ones.

Yes, thank God, I, like Debs, can say that my sympathy and praise goes out to the colored man, and I have no apology to make to any living man or dead. I thank God, that if I knew this man Jerry, that fed my brother and me, was still living that I would willingly walk through more mud and rain to shake his old black hand than all the Clevelands, Roosevelts and such like on earth. Mark you, this man Jerry was sold a short time before the war began, and at the time he was doing this generous act of kindness to my brother and me he was owned by ex-Governor Neel S. Brown.

I am determined to defend the colored race's political and economic rights in spite of all the "critics" in and out of Hades. As to their social right, I will say that I would by far rather be associated with a nigger that would feed me than with a white man that would starve me.

Tullahoma, Tenn.

JO. H. BAXTER.

#### NO DUES.

I would suggest the following for the consideration of the party: Discontinue the stamp system, and substitute a system similar to the one adopted by the American Labor Union recently; that is, the monthly card system.

For instance, the national secretary would have printed for each state a number of membership cards, being numbered consecutively. These would be turned over to the state secretaries, who would be held responsible for them; they in turn would send a certain number to the local secretaries, holding them responsible for these cards.

I believe that the collection of dues would be easier under such a system than what it is at the present time; it of course would also be a greater expense.

This system would require but very little accounting.

Fraternally, JOHN HAGEL.

Oklahoma City, O. T.

#### SOME RESOLUTIONS.

I favor the removal of the immediate demands from our platform, and the incorporation of all demands agreed upon in a set of resolutions.

And I want to say, too, in support of my proffered resolutions, that the first will place our party in an impregnable position to the vicious assaults by the church; and I wish I might urge this particularly, because of the fact that our convention convenes on Sunday, as in the campaign we could then point out that, not only is Jesus the Lord of the Sabbath, but also the churches make a regular practice of holding their convention meetings on Sunday. In further contention for the propriety of this resolution, let me ask that we turn to the sixth chapter of Matthew and read the fifteen concluding verses of that chapter, and we will find that these fifteen verses contain not only the law, the whole law, which Jesus laid

down on which to found his kingdom, but we find that these verses hold not only the fundamental basis but the whole policy of socialism; because, when the full sense and meaning contained therein is all summed up in small compass, it cannot be seen otherwise than that this law decrees that all mankind were not only created equal but we are here commanded to remain, permanently, on an exactly equal basis of rights.

The second resolve, it is believed, will prove a most excellent vote getter, and will be undeniable evidence that we socialists not only preach and teach, but believe and want to practice an exact equality of human rights.

Resolved, That the Socialist Party insists upon a government by strict philosophy of Jesus." That "socialism is the enemy of capitalism," which clearly Jesus also was, and that "the church, both Catholic and Protestant, in its support of modern capitalism, antagonizes the political program of the working class, and sets itself at variance with" and in open hostility to Jesus and the law He has laid down on which to found His kingdom; and

Resolved, That the Socialist Party insists upon a government by strict majority rule; therefore we demand that an initiative and referendum law be enacted in such form as to make the will and wish of the majority as expressed at the ballot box the supreme and sovereign law and court of last resort; and

Resolved, That the Socialist Party regards any increase in the present salary of the president of the United States as uncalled for and unjust, and that it would be more propitious to diminish the said official's salary to \$25,000 per annum rather than increase the same at all.

Muscatine, Iowa.

CORWIN LESLEY.

#### CONSTRUCTION, NOT DENUNCIATION NEEDED.

Comrades:—A half century of observation and experience confirms the writer in the opinion that the platform of the Socialist party should be directed to tearing down the opposition and building up a better system. Leave out all or as much reference to present conditions of class to be benefited as possible.

Every intelligent and conscious person so to be benefited realizes his condition without being constantly reminded of it.

I think that keeping their condition before them in the platform (I know this to be my condition) has a tendency to repel rather than to draw towards the movement. I do not like to have my misfortunes paraded before me at every step. I prefer to look hopefully to the future. I think that is the general disposition. Socialist literature should be devoted largely to contemplation and planning for the socialist government. The hope for better things in the future is inherent in man. It prevents self-destruction many times.

It does not seem that Socialism should indorse or meddle with any movement or organization, whatever, except Socialism. It offends some who belong to the Socialist movement otherwise. There are many in sympathy with the movement who have nothing in common with trades unionism. Many laudable movements have been spoiled by trying to ride too many horses, seeking to straddle too many mounts. Socialism wants nothing else. Leave out all reference to trade unionism. It is not Socialism. But a small part of Socialists are trade unionists. Trade unionism is all right battling with present conditions, but has no part or parcel in Socialism. I inclose structure for platform.

Fraternally,

A. L. PURDY.

Wellsville, N. Y.

#### SOCIALISM AND RELIGION.

I would like to see incorporated in the next platform of the Socialist party a declaration in substance as follows: "We declare religion to be

a private matter," taking our stand neither for or against any religion, church or sect whatsoever.

I believe that such a plank should be inserted for the following reasons:

First, that the Socialist party is an economic movement and not religious.

Second, that the party has enough to fight in capitalism at present.

Third, that if a religion or church be wrong, it is the province of infidelity, atheism, materialism, etc., to prove it so, and vice versa if the latter be in error, it is for the former to furnish the proof, and in neither case is it the work of a political or economical party.

Fourth, that while churchianity (not Christianity) has opposed all great social evolutions, yet when they have been established churchianity has readily adjusted itself thereto, and there is no reason to believe that it will be otherwise in regard to Socialism.

Fifth, that if we mean business and are really anxious for the operative commonwealth, we will gain our end quicker by concentrating our guns on capitalism alone, otherwise we will not only make another enemy and elicit their united fire, but will give them a good reason for opposing us, and thus increase their morale.

Sixth, if we accept battle and take up arms against churchianity we will not only gain members from that source much slower than at present, but will actually lose a large number of earnest class-conscious Socialists. I know this from positive assertions.

Seventh, by adopting such a plank we would not lose a single skeptic, nor elicit their antagonism, while it would take away the effective thunder from priest, preacher and layman.

Eighth, such action would be perfectly fair to all parties and would permit of all working for Socialism.

Ninth, such action is called for both from utterances from the pulpit and by a large class of Socialistic writers, who invariably take particular pains in their works on Socialism to attack the church, or fault, ridicule or snarl at its teachings.

E. L. RIGG.

Glenn's Ferry, Idaho.

# EDITORIAL

## The National Convention.

The present number of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW is one of which we feel that the Socialist party of America may well be proud. It constitutes the most thorough attempt ever made by any political party to work out the details of its organization and policy in a democratic manner. The large number of contributions represent every phase of thought that will appear at the convention, and the wide circulation which this number will receive makes it certain that these opinions will have great influence in determining the work of the convention and the future policy of Socialism in America.

We shall not attempt to consider editorially all the questions that have arisen in the course of the discussion. It would appear that unfortunately one of the principal struggles of the convention will be over the question of "immediate demands." I say "unfortunate" because of the ridiculous insignificance of this question compared with many other problems concerning methods of propaganda and work that must be settled. Our opinion on this, which coincides with that of several of the contributors, has been often expressed before. We believe that some sort of an explanatory document should be issued for the guidance of such officials as may be elected to office on Socialist tickets. We *will* elect these officers during the next two or three years, whether we *wish* to or not, and it would be cowardly on our part to shirk the responsibility for such election. But such election does not give the individual elected any great amount of brains in excess of those he had before election. To permit him to use his own judgment as to what he shall do is to adopt the very unsocialistic doctrine that he is more capable of formulating a program that the entire party membership, including himself. To give the control over to a committee is only a triflingly less undemocratic. Either method would be much more dangerous than the adoption of a similar plan in our party administration which would give to the national secretary or to the national committee absolute power unrestricted by any constitution. Such a plan may be all right for democrats and republicans, or for the politicians who wish to practice the same tactics within the Socialist party. But for those who believe in democratic management and Socialist principles, such methods are out of consideration. At the same time we have no use for any attachment to our

platform which will enable any one to claim that any change within capitalism constitutes socialism, or any part of socialism. For that reason we are now, as we were at the time when there were no more than half a dozen other persons with us, against "immediate demands" as a part of our platform.

The first offices which we will capture will be municipal ones, and, strange as it may seem, it is our opinion that one of the most important things for a NATIONAL convention to do will be to arrange for the directing of MUNICIPAL affairs. We give elsewhere in this number a summary of the work done by a convention of Socialist municipal councillors in France. This is done, not so much because of the suggestion for a municipal program which accompanies the report (since there is much in this which we oppose and little of it suited to America), as simply to show the methods by which the Socialists of that country are working out their plans for municipal administration.

On the question of internal organization of the party we believe that the following plan meets some of the objections which have been urged against our present method: Let each state elect as many national committeemen as it is entitled to under the system of proportional representation. These committeemen may, or may not, as the states choose, also act as a state committee. Let one member be chosen from each state who shall act as national committeeman when it is necessary to hold a meeting of the committee and who shall have but one vote. Insert a provision in the constitution that on the demand of any two committeemen at a meeting of the national committee any action taken at the meeting shall be referred to a referendum of the entire committee. Since 90 per cent of the business is done by referendum, taken by mail, it makes but little difference whether there be 45 or 500 members on the committee. This is one alternative. The other is to abolish the local quorum and national committee entirely and substitute the various state committees with the proviso that any action of the national secretary may be called in question and a referendum of the state committees initiated by any state so desiring. It seems to us that the main object should be the concentration of administration and the decentralization of authority. Bearing these principles in view the details are of less importance.

Concerning farmers, negroes, trade unions, etc., it seems to us that the national platform should simply be so framed as to include all the producers of wealth whose interests are in accordance with that of the modern proletariat, and if this is done, all special distinctions may be left out. This applies also to national, race or sex organizations. The national organization should be made broad enough to include all those accepting the program and principles of Socialism, and every effort to divide Socialists within those lines should be frowned upon. The organization of Italians, Poles, Bohemians, Germans, negroes, or of women as separate organizations is something which cannot but be fraught with the possibility of harm and promises but little good. Surely if our solidarity cannot be expressed in our organization it never can remain anything but a dream.

# THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

After months of negotiations the bituminous miners have voted to accept a reduction of  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent in wages, this being a compromise on the demands of the operators from a 12 per cent cut, and, therefore, all danger of a strike in the soft coal fields is over. That the rank and file were opposed to accepting a decrease in wages and only voted to come to the operators' terms at the earnest request of the national officers is generally understood. In the address to the members, when the referendum vote was called for, they were informed that the organization was in no position to conduct a national strike under present industrial conditions, and that to throw down their tools and fight the operators at this time would merely invite disaster and ruin. During the joint conventions the miners' officials had laid especial stress upon the fact that the operators are receiving a higher price for coal than ever before, and this fact, as well as the prevailing high living rates, did not warrant a decrease in wages at this time. The operators were further given to understand that a cut in wages meant a lessened purchasing power, which in time would result in overproduction, industrial stagnation and hard times and misery. So, with or without a strike, we are in for a season of economic depression and its train of evils. The disadvantages of which the miners complained before agreeing to the reduction are still here. The living rates are not only not decreasing, but actually increasing, and the plea of the operators for a lower wage scale in order that they might be enabled to sell coal cheaper and stimulate consumption was so much buncombe, and it is questionable whether the operators will lower prices and the miners secure the steady work which they have been promised for making the sacrifice. Incidentally the "fool dinner pail" has had a couple more holes knocked into it despite the loyalty of the vast majority of miners in sticking to the old parties, and the lines of the class struggle have become plainer. "I do not believe there is an irrepressible conflict between labor and capital," is a favorite expression of John Mitchell, but what his belief may be and what actually is don't "jibe" just at present, although the miners' officials and the operators had their feet under the same table, looked each other in the eye and had a heart to heart talk. Just because some one may not believe the world is round doesn't follow that it is flat. The "irrepressible conflict" was here before Mitchell was born, and it will not stand still or disappear altogether because he commands. Whether it be through strikes and boycotts, or conciliation and negotiation, the conflict between labor and capital for higher wages on the one hand and higher profits on the other is irrepressible, and will so continue until the system, the cause, is removed by labor acquiring control of the governing power and using it to retain for itself the wealth, from which profits and capital come, produced by labor. While the miners may have lost in the industrial struggle they can strike to good advantage at the ballot box this fall by voting with the Socialist party. That party declares that the miners shall have as a "fair share" of the wealthy they produce, not a reduction of  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent or an

increase of 10 or 20 per cent, but all the wealth they produce or its equivalent.

Since the miners have been forced to accept a lower wage rate—although never better organized than at present—many union officials, as well as the labor press, are beginning to wonder whether unbridled capitalism will attempt to make a clean sweep and compel the workers in other branches of industry to agree to a reduction. The miners are engaged in the industry upon which all others rest; they are the foundation; they are right down in nature's storehouse. Having consented to work for less wages, the miners opened the door to the conquering capitalists, and the latter will not be slow in taking advantage of the opportunity to show Brother Labor how to do "business." Much interest is taken in the probable action of the iron, steel and tin plate workers, who hold their annual convention in Cleveland next month. As has been stated in a former issue of the REVIEW, the United States Steel Corporation has given notice that a reduction in wages will be enforced when the present scale expires this summer, and that the unions will no longer be recognized, but the open shop principle will be introduced in all the trust plants. The iron and steel workers, judging from the discussion among the rank and file, are not inclined to accept the new terms that the trust magnates are aiming to dictate without a struggle, and it is a question whether the national officers will be able to influence the men to make the concessions demanded as easily as in the miners' case. Indeed, it is claimed that President Shaffer will lose his official head this year because he has not displayed sufficient firmness in dealing with the employers. Just who will be his successor it is difficult to determine, as there are a number of candidates in the race, and it is even rumored that Mahlon Garland, ex-president of the amalgamated association, is to resign his political job and again go to the head of the organization. Garland would be the candidate of the conservatives, who argue that he possesses the confidence of many influential iron and steel magnates, and, therefore, would be able to gain better conditions than the trust now offers.

In this connection it is worth noting that the National Civic Federation has again come into the public eye. That aggregation has been greatly strengthened by the acquisition of the brightest particular star in the industrial firmament. Mr. Andrew Carnegie will fill the late Senator Hanna's shoes. This was decided upon at a dinner given in New York recently by Mr. Oscar Straus in honor of the iron master, and the dispatches announced that "among those present" were James Duncan, W. D. Mahon, Mahlon Garland and several other "labor leaders." No capitalists were mentioned as being in attendance—just at this juncture they occupied a back seat. The fact that only "labor leaders" were named as feasting with Carnegie is significant, as is also the further fact that Mr. Theodore Shaffer announced in an interview that he would not sit at the same table with Mr. Mahlon Garland. The latter gentleman does not represent organized labor at present. He is busy "keeping politics out of the union" and playing the game himself, and, putting two and two together, it looks as though we are soon to witness another great "harmonizing" act—a regular Damon and Pythias performance—in which the suspected heavy villain, Carnegie, will turn out to be a real hero and rush to the center of the stage and save somebody or something. For several weeks before the New York dinner the capitalistic press bureaus were busy manufacturing a character for Mr. Carnegie. It was explained that if he had been in the country during the Homestead strike that struggle would never have proven a disaster for the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, and from which they have never recovered. But the poor man, unfortunately, was hunting and fishing in his Scotch preserves by day and dreaming of triumphant capitalism in Cluny Castle at night. There is no record that the telegraph and cable lines were all broken, and that he could not send a message to

his wicked partners, Frick & Co. It is recorded, however, that he did reply to a message sent to Scotland to the effect that he would not interfere in the great Homestead strike, and from that day to this the Carnegie mills have been non-union and dictated wages in the iron and steel industry. From every point of view Carnegie is a valuable addition to the Civic Federation. He has so much money that he is compelled to give it away to build churches and libraries for fear of being crushed by a burden of cares. Therefore, like Senator Hanna, he can easily pay Secretary Easley's salary of \$10,000 a year, as well as provide sumptuous offices and meet the drain of a private pay roll. And all for the sake of harmony and the glory of labor, Lord bless us! Let us hope and pray that Frick and Parry will also find room in the happy family.

The various national associations of employers and citizens' alliances continue to push their "open shop" campaign in a vigorous manner. The announcement of the iron and steel trust that unions will no longer be recognized has lent great encouragement to the Parryites, as also the declarations of metal trades bosses and building contractors in different sections of the country. The victory of the marble workers' bosses has been followed by a defeat of the typefounders by their employers and a lockout of the lithographers throughout the country. In Pittsburg the building trades lost their fight against the open shop policy, and struggles are on in New York, Cincinnati and many smaller places, with others threatening. Very properly capitalists are giving credit to President Roosevelt as being "the father of the open shop." The contractors of New York and Pennsylvania and in some parts of Ohio and Michigan have taken official cognizance of this fact and in eulogistic resolutions the president is praised for having enforced the open shop policy in the government printing office in the decision in the famous Miller case. Roosevelt's Anthracite Strike Commission also decided in favor of that principle, and United States Labor Commissioner Wright followed the precedent in rendering awards in cases in which he acted as umpire in the anthracite region. While President Roosevelt may give comfort to the Parryites and pretend to stand for "all the people," it is not likely that the thinking trade unionists of this country will disband their organizations and wax enthusiastic over Teddy and hail him as a new Savior. The unionists will continue to do business at the old stand, come what will, and will also learn to use their political power instead of voting it into the possession of their opponents. The lines of the class struggle are being more sharply drawn by the capitalists and their politicians this year than ever before, and there may be a strike at the ballot box next November that will be heard pretty well around the world.

The Socialist party will undoubtedly be the only party that will go on record on the open shop proposition. As this number of the REVIEW will contain a symposium relating to questions that will probably come up at the national convention on the first of next month, I am of the opinion that the declaration regarding trade unions should be reaffirmed, with such additions that will make plain the hypocrisy of the open shop agitation, and the blame for its widespread publicity should be placed where it belongs. No doubt many other matters of interest to the membership and the working class generally will be discussed and acted upon, but few are more important at this time than the open shop issue. The life of union labor is largely at stake in this struggle, and we will not permit the surrender and disruption of organizations, industrial or political, without a fight to the finish.

## PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

### A SOCIALIST PUBLISHING HOUSE.

A daintily printed booklet bearing this title has just been published, and a copy will be mailed without charge to any one asking for it. It explains in full detail the plan of organization of the co-operative publishing house, and shows the personal and the general advantages of subscribing for its stock.

The publishing house is the property of 830 Socialists, none of whom draw dividends, but all whom have the privilege of buying an increasing variety of books at cost. They have voted to extend this privilege on equal terms to 4,000 more Socialists. The one important thing to accomplish now is to find the 4,000 subscribers to buy the stock. The money thus raised will put the work of the publishing house on a basis where it will not be dependent on the life of any one individual, but will grow with the growth of the Socialist movement.

If you are not a stockholder, send for one of the booklets and consider whether you cannot subscribe at once. If you are a stockholder, send us the names of others who are able to help in the same way.

### BACK NUMBERS OF THE REVIEW—CLEARANCE SALE.

We have on hand a limited supply of back numbers of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, including a few of every issue except that for September, 1900, which can be had only in the bound volume. Our supply of other issues is very unequal, and to close out quickly our surplus of those of which we have the most we will send to any address three copies, our selection, for 10 cents, and more at the same rate. For one dollar we will mail thirty different issues, no two alike. Larger orders will have to include duplicates. Please notice that where the purchaser specifies particular issues the price will be 10 cents a copy or \$1 for twelve copies, with a discount of one-half to stockholders.

### THE REVIEW FOR MAY.

The May number will contain a full report of the work of the convention of the Socialist party of America, including the platform, the resolutions adopted, and a summary of the most interesting discussions, together with

brief sketches of the personalities of the candidates of the party for president and vice-president. This number will thus be of both historical and propaganda value. Orders for extra copies must be sent in at once, accompanied by the cash, since only enough copies can be printed to supply the probable demand. Price, 10 cents a copy; to locals that are not stockholders, 7 cents; to stockholders, 5 cents.

#### BOOKS BY DR. HALPHIDE.

While our co-operative company is making no new investment in the publication of any but Socialist books, its managers realize that most Socialists are interested in books of a general scientific character, and we therefore welcome the opportunity to give the benefits of co-operation on valuable books of this sort. Such an opportunity has lately offered in the case of two books by Dr. A. C. Halphide, of Chicago, entitled respectively "Mind and Body" and "The Psychic and Psychism." These books deal in a really scientific way, from a materialist viewpoint, with topics which are too often treated with a mixture of quackery and hysterical mysticism. "Mind and Body" deals with the phenomena of hypnotism, and includes simple, scientific directions for inducing the hypnotic state, which are of more practical value than the widely advertised courses of instruction for which large sums of money are charged. "The Psychic and Psychism" deals with the phenomena of clairvoyance, and offers a rational explanation for such of the alleged facts as are not pure humbug. Both books are well worth reading; they contain facts that are new to most physicians, while they are written in a style intelligible to the ordinary reader. The price of each book is one dollar, postage included, while our stockholders are entitled to the special rate of sixty cents by mail or fifty cents by express.

#### AMERICAN PAUPERISM AND THE ABOLITION OF POVERTY.

This book, by Isador Ladoff, which was first announced some months ago, and which has been somewhat delayed in the printing, is now ready. It is a book of unusually timely value for the campaign of 1904, considered both as an educational and a propaganda work. The author has put an immense deal of labor into an analysis of the census of 1900, and has brought to light a host of facts such as the capitalistic manipulators of census figures would have wished to keep concealed. The book constitutes one of the most powerful arguments for the support of the Socialist party of America that has yet been offered. One remark in passing may not be out of place. Comrade Ladoff's earlier work, "The Passing of Capitalism," was a collection of detached essays on various topics, some of which set forth the so-called Bernstein or opportunist view. The position of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW on this question is well known, and we do not wish to reopen the discussion here. We merely wish to correct a misapprehension in some quarters by pointing out that "American Pauperism" is in no sense an opportunist work, but deals with topics on which all Socialists are agreed, so that we can without hesitation recommend it for

propaganda as well as for study. It is the ninth volume in the Standard Socialist Series, and is the largest book yet printed in the series, containing 246 pages. Price, 50 cents; to stockholders, 30 cents by mail or 25 cents by express.

#### LOW PRICED PROPAGANDA LEAFLETS.

In response to many requests, we have reprinted five popular propaganda leaflets, each containing four pages, the right size to slip into a letter, and offer them at the uniform cost price, to stockholders and non-stockholders alike, of 60 cents a thousand by mail and 30 cents a thousand by express at purchaser's expense. The titles are "Labor Politics" and "Compensation," by A. M. Simons, and "Who Are the Socialists?" "Socialism Defined by Socialists" and "Why Join the Socialist Party," by Charles H. Kerr. Each leaflet bears on the last page the words "You are invited to a Socialist meeting at \_\_\_\_\_," with a blank space underneath for stamping the time and place of meeting. For the convenience of comrades who are located where rubber stamps cannot be obtained conveniently, we have made an arrangement by which we can mail a two-line stamp and inking pad for 30 cents, each additional line of printing 10 cents. A plan of propaganda which has proved effective is to get permission from the city authorities to hold meetings on one particular corner one evening each week for several weeks. Then have a rubber stamp made with the words "Corner Main and State Streets, Saturday Evening at Eight," or whatever the place and time fixed upon may be. Then order a thousand each of the five leaflets, and distribute one kind each week for five weeks, of course stamping each leaflet before it is put out. The cash outlay of this experiment will be only \$1.80 besides expressage, and it will almost certainly make a success of the series of open air meetings.

A sample set of the leaflets will be mailed for a 2-cent stamp, or a hundred assorted leaflets for 10 cents. Address Charles H. Kerr & Company (Co-operative), 56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.